

## Public Comments by Case

**Total Comments:** 1921  
**In Favor:** 2  
**Opposed:** 1911  
**Undecided:** 8

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Glen Steele	E-mail	<p>It's time that our state Utilities and Transportation Commission sides with the people and stop rubber stamping rate hikes for monopoly energy utilities that are forcing continued dependence on dirty fossil fuels!! PSE has already raised their fracked gas rates. Now they are back for more.</p> <p>Regards, Glen Steele</p>
	Richard Lauckhart	E-mail	<p>***See attachments for multiple comments from Richard***</p>
	Jenny Hoffman	E-mail	<p>I have received a notification that our PSE rate will increase 12.15% next year and increasing rates the following two years as well. I am fine paying higher rates to pay for employees and infrastructure. What I am not okay with is the return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9% to investors. They do NOT need to increase their profits off the backs of the hard working people of Washington State during a time of recession and higher living costs. Please stand up to big business and stand up for your communities. We have choices to not spend our money with other businesses, but we have no choice who we purchase our power from. We need your support to stop this needless increase from happening. Thank you.</p>
	Dale Walter	E-mail	<p>One thing we can always expect is a rate increase on a regular basis from PSE! This request is ridiculous, especially during a high period of inflation. With very high food costs and gasoline costs, those of us on a fixed income are really struggling.</p> <p>Increases in our utility's costs further fuel inflation. I certainly hope the Commission does not approve this request! The timing could not be worse!</p> <p>Sincerely,          Dale Walter</p>

	Peg Giffels	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you for the flier included in my recent PSE bill outlining proposed rate increases, and the rationale for them, for 2023-2025. My main point is that the proposed total increase of 17% over three years seems steep, and I see no information about any cost cutting or efficiency measures PSE plans to undertake. So I ask you to consider the impact on PSE customers.</p> <p>I am a longtime PSE natural gas customer living in Seattle. I'm a customer because...I have no choice, no other provider for this service. Nothing about my income is going up at a similar rate — not salary, certainly not stocks, not Social Security if that still exists when I'm eligible. So when I see a proposed increase of this magnitude, what recourse do I have? Where is the 17% to PSE supposed to come from?</p> <p>In Monopoly, utilities are a safe bet, paying a steady return. How can PSE be more steady like that, by increasing efficiency and reducing cost rather than increasing charges to customers who are reliant on their service with no alternative?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Peg Giffels Seattle, WA</p>
	Robert Durham	E-mail	<p>To who it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to submit my concern/opposition to the electric rate increase requested by Puget Sound Energy. This electric rate increase will severely impact people on a fixed income (like us), who are having to try and absorb these outrageous price increases in all consumer goods AND the double digit property tax increases being generated by the insanely hot real estate market.</p> <p>I can understand that Puget's costs have gone up but a 16.34% increase for 800kwh in 2023!! That's outrageous, how about Puget tighten their belt a little more to at least limit the increases to a more reasonable 2-3% per year increase over the 3 year period. At least that would be more in line with general wage increases that the average person might expect to see.</p> <p>Their is no reason that during these tough times Puget should worry about anything more than doing the bare minimum to keep the lights on and meet their existing financial obligations.</p> <p>They don't need to be advertising on TV, supporting baseball teams, symphonies and for sure don't need to get an increase to 9.9% on equity return. Most average people get no where near an 9.4% return on equity, ratepayers don't need to subsidize stockholders/corporate salaries.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and protect us ratepayers from this excessive rate increase requested for 2023 and limit these increases to a reasonable amount.</p> <p>Thank you for your service to us and your attention to this email.</p>

			Robert Durham
	Valerie Krull	E-mail	<p>I am commenting as PSE customer. I strongly believe that PSE already has a hefty profit margin in a system that offers us no real choice. I vote for no rate increase and ask this multinational company to carry its own weight and not put it on the backs of struggling citizens.</p> <p>Sincerely, Valerie Krull</p>
	Ed Richards Jr.	E-mail	<p>I am opposed to the proposed rate increase. Years ago, PSE switched their computer system in doing so it created a huge increase in their operating expenses. I own three properties in a close proximity to one another and are on the same billing cycle. With their old system all three of my billings came together in one envelope. With the new system I get three separate billings requiring triple the cost postage of the mailing, triple the envelopes included and triple the newsletter sheets all of the paper used now becoming landfill or recycle matter. I am one of their thousands of customers and I am sure I am not the only one in this same situation.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ed Richards, Jr</p>
	Brenda Supasatit	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington State UTC,</p> <p>I am one citizen that is speaking up on behalf of many WA State Citizens who are under a heavy financial load from ever rising vehicle gas prices. The high price of vehicle gas prices, plus the requested hike of 12-15% for residential customers will leave many residents choosing between keeping warm, having food on the table or traveling to work.</p> <p>If there are other ways to deal with the budget to not charge this huge hike, please consider them!</p> <p>I pray you will have wisdom to think of other budget ways to work around the state's mandate to decarbonize energy sytems. This is a real crisis for Washington residents and utility customers.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Respectfully, Brenda Supasatit</p>

	Bryan Higgins	E-mail	<p>I'm writing opposing PSEs request to increase electric and natural gas rates. (Dockets UE 220066 UG 220067. ) Customers are being squeezed with higher prices on every thing and no one has the money to afforded this increase. PSE is asking for a whopping 35% increase in rates over the next 3 years. This is extremely outrageous and unsustainable from a customer perspective. Anyone living on a fixed income cannot absorb this cost increase. Please ask PSE to propose a more modest and sustainable increase, one that all customers can afford. Providing power should not be a for profit business.</p> <p>Sincerely Bryan Higgins</p>
	Aj Notch	E-mail	<p>Reference: UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067</p> <p>I am against the subject rate increases, because I will feel the full brunt of the cost, as follows:</p> <p>I have been retired since 1995, have not had earned income since, yet do not qualify for PSE utility, property tax or Renton utility subsidies.</p> <p>It is well known that latter two subsidies, and I expect the one for PSE as well, result in costs being double what they'd be without subsidies (involuntary donations to charity).</p> <p>Subsidies should not be a part of any of these costs, but a separate state welfare program or not exist at all. I was taught that if one can't afford a home, which incurs these costs, one should not own it.</p> <p>AJ Notch</p>
	Heidi Beck	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to protest the 13.59% / 12.98% rate increases proposed by PSE for 2023, followed by more modest single digit (under 5%) rate increases for 2024 and 2025 (included in my recent bill).</p> <p>Although I am sure the cost of doing energy business has gone up along with everything else, why the huge increase next year? On top of inflation and gas prices, how are lower and middle income folks possibly expected to accommodate yet one more large jump? At the very least, could not PSE average out the total increase more equally over the 3-year period?</p> <p>Please do not approve the increases without a more balanced (and manageable) rate.</p>



			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.</p> <p>Sincerely, Heidi A. Beck</p>
Richard Wolfe	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I urge Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to reject Puget Sound Energy’s latest request for rate changes. They are excessive in scope, burdensome to customers, and unjustified by the reasons provided. Hasn’t PSE been prior investing “to provide safe and reliable energy service,” or is this a new focus? Are we to believe that the system decarbonization mandates came as a surprise them in the last few months? Did the prior rate request not envision the last four years of capital and operating investments? Have operating costs really and significantly exceeded inflation (recall that these pressures only date to 2021)? Are the “upcoming capital investments and operating costs” really on pace to exceed current inflation (and, if so, why)? And, why should customers be on the hook to pay for increasing “PSE’s authorized return on equity”, especially at a time when those same customers face declining real wages and spiraling inflation in critical housing, transportation and food?</p> <p>I received the “Notice of Requested Changes to PSE Rates and Public Hearings” (hereafter “The Notice”) on July 13, 2022. The date of receipt is important; that same day the June CPI data was announced, at a stunning 9.1% aggregate. As the old adage goes, “ timing is everything.” So, at a time when consumers are being drowned by inflation—struggling to balance feeding their families, buying gas to go to work, and affording skyrocketing housing—PSE wants to raise utility rates. Really? According to The Notice, the average residential customer would pay 14.47% more for gas and electric service next year alone under the request, and then face additional increases for the subsequent two years. And, this is only the direct cost to the residential customer; that same customer will foot the bill for the non-residential increases through associated inflationary pressures accruing to goods and services as well as higher taxes to cover increased lighting (area and street) and other utility costs faced by the municipalities in which they reside. The rationale, as provided in The Notice and summarized above can only be described as tone deaf and outrageous. It must be rejected and replaced with rate increases calibrated to cover actual needs to support PSE’s mandate, sans increasing the monopoly’s ROE on the backs of a struggling customer base.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Richard Wolfe</p>	

			Sammanish, WA
	Kathy Florence	E-mail	<p>I am a Pierce County homeowner and wish to comment on Puget Sound Energy's request to raise electric rates effective Jan 1 2023.</p> <p>Everyone in our country is suffering the highest inflation rate in decades. Our purchasing power is severely diminished.</p> <p>I am a retired senior woman living on a fixed income. Even if I wanted to get a job, options would be limited for someone my age.</p> <p>I moved here from California five years ago primarily because my dollar would go further here in Washington. Now it feels like there's not much difference between the states, and that is very discouraging.</p> <p>A 15.80% increase in rates next year is unconscionable. For me, every dollar counts. As it is, I don't use lamps during the day. I don't use my one window a/c unless necessary (like 90° or higher). I do laundry once a week. The only thing that's always on is the refrigerator. I don't qualify for reduced rates for seniors.</p> <p>I am BEGGING you not to raise electric rates so drastically. Find other measures you can take to reach the goals stated in your Notice ... measures that do NOT involve passing along increased rates to your customers!!!</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Kathy Florence</p>
	Nick Santarosa	E-mail	<p>The rate increases submitted by PSE are very unfair and worrisome to consumers like me who is on fixed income and elderly. This is the problem with having a monopoly on these services. PSE along with Wave Broadband (Astound), Waste Management, and Kitsap PUD do not have any competition so they keep charging more for higher profits. I submit this comment because I think the situation is getting out of hand and we are the ones suffering. I just hope somebody there is listening.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Nick Santarosa</p>

	Sylvia M.	E-mail	<p>This is simply ridiculous to put these increases on people with fixed incomes. Get rid of all the “fluff” employees who do nothing. Work within your means like we have to live within our means. We will have more homeless people living on the streets than we have people living in homes.</p> <p>Sylvia M.</p>
	Briana Cox	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to note my opposition to the massive rate increases of over 15% proposed by PSE. As a resident of Thurston County and a homeowner, I think these increases are egregious. PSE has a monopoly on the market and therefore knows there is little for us citizens to do but pay the hikes while PSE pockets the over 1.6 billion in anticipated profits over 3 years from this rate increase alone. Please reconsider pushing this extreme rate increase onto your customers.</p> <p>Thank you for reading.</p> <p>Briana Cox</p>
	Michelle Swanson	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I oppose PSE’s proposed increase to electricity rates. 13.59% is way too high.</p> <p>I’m less bothered by the proposed increase to natural gas rates, as we need to use less gas in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Increasing the price is one way to do that, although I’d like to see them reinvest what they get from us in better programs to decarbonize our houses. The rebates they offer now are a drop in the bucket.</p> <p>If PSE wants to decarbonize the grid and pay for upgrades, I’d like to see them cut into their profit margins first before increasing our rates. We’re already paying them way too much.</p> <p>Thanks for listening, Michelle Swanson Olympia</p>
	Mike McRae	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern,</p>

			<p>Pursuant to PSE's request for general rate hikes in 2023-25. I recognize the cost of everything is going up, but almost 18% over three years, I don't think so!! Utility prices are regulated for a reason, and this proposal certainly appears to demonstrate why.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if PSE can really prove they need this increase to continue to provide existing services, then so be it. However, if this is as it appears, just another opportunistic money grab using desirable but unnecessary environmental considerations as an excuse to grow and modernize, then say no!! Everyone out here, especially those of us on fixed incomes, are hurting right now. Don't pour salt in the wound!!</p> <p>Regards, Mike McRae</p>						
	Mikel Howell	E-mail	<p>While is it understandable that with all prices increasing, utilities must increase to pay their employees etc. But the percentage of increase being asked for is huge!</p> <p>PSE is not like a supermarket that a person can choose to shop elsewhere if he/she can't afford their prices. If a person lives in their service area, the customer either has to pay their rate or go without. That increase is going to create a big hardship on seniors and low income families!</p> <p>Please only grant 6.5% increase instead of the overall 15.80%.</p> <p>Thank—you for allowing our input. Mikel</p>						
	Al & Sandy Olsen	E-mail	<p>RE: Dockets UE-220066 (electric service)</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>The electric rates that PSE has proposed for next year (2023) are ridiculously high. There request for a 15.8% increase is laughable to say the least especially during this country's extreme inflation period that is expected to continue next year. The fact that PSE wishes to have this multiyear price increases leads to a 19.62% over the three year period. Enough is enough!</p> <p>A very fair increase would be:</p> <table><tr><td>6%</td><td>for 2023</td></tr><tr><td>2.62%</td><td>for 2024</td></tr><tr><td>1.20%</td><td>for 2025</td></tr></table> <p>total 9.82% for the three year period</p>	6%	for 2023	2.62%	for 2024	1.20%	for 2025
6%	for 2023								
2.62%	for 2024								
1.20%	for 2025								

			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the PSE proposed pricing increases.</p> <p>Al Olsen Coupeville</p>
Jorji Knickrehm	E-mail	<p>Dear Puget Sound Energy,</p> <p>Thanks for giving customers such as myself the opportunity to comment on PSE's proposed rate changes. My husband and I have been PSE customers for the past 20 years in Seattle. We were very surprised by the large and what we feel is unacceptable rate of increases over the next three years. To increase residents' rate by approximately 17% over 3 years is unreasonable and will cause financial distress to many residents. PSE should decrease the overall rate changes for electricity and gas in 2023 (the year PSE is proposing overall average increases of 12-15.8%) by at least half. Utilities should not make profits; they are public goods. If investments in infrastructure need to be made, that is understandable, but not by charging residents 12 to 15.8% more in one year. This kind of extreme increase could cause people to default on their payments or be unable to pay for food and other necessary items.</p> <p>Thank you for listening,</p> <p>Jorji Knickrehm and Jason Rich</p>	
Bob Crittenden	E-mail	<p>I can only agree with the increases for operations and capital increases and rely on your review to ensure those are needed and appropriate. I do question the increase in return on equity of almost 10%. They will be in the range of pharmaceutical company profits. There are few people/organizations now investing that make that year to year. In fact the structure you have provided guarantees them that return. Everyone else hopes for that return and uses it to counterbalance expected downturns - as we are now seeing. A more reasonable guaranteed return on equity would be 6%. I suggest you taper the return on equity over a few years with a large decrease in the first year to partially pay for the increased rates consumers will pay.</p> <p>Afterall, we are paying for their capital, their increased operating costs and their decarbonization efforts. They should contribute to those efforts by tapering instead of increasing guaranteed profits.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Robert A Crittenden, Consumer</p>	

			-- Bob Crittenden
Thomas Goetzl	E-mail	To whom it should concern:  This is a response to the Notice of requested changes tp PSE rates and public hearings I received July 16, 2022.  PSE's requested rate increase(s) should be denied. They would be inflationary. There is no justification for PSE seeking to increase its "authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%.  Even 9.4% is an unnecessarily high rate of return for what is essentially a risk-free investment. Increasing it can only harm hard-pressed consumers, few of whom are able to earn more than 1 or 2% returns on their meager savings.  Furthermore, if rates are to be raised, they should be raised on the high users (e.g., commercial and industrial users,) since they are in the best position to implement meaningful conservation measures. Residential users should be protected from increases in these extremely difficult times.  Thank you.  Tom Goetzl Bellingham	
Jeanette Marquardt	E-mail	I am a Natural Gas Service Customer and I can't believe the 12.15% increase in 2023 and all the increases thereafter.  There are many people who can't even afford to pay their increases in rent and mortgages and then to get hit with an increase of that amount is insane. Many people are forced from their homes and apartments becuz of the high increase in rents. It is all about greed. Not willing to help people.  There are many of us who are retired and on a fixed income and with all the prices going up; it is difficult to make ends meet anymore.  I could understand a smaller amount, but you have increases every single year which I feel is not necessary. I have PUD for electricity and this is the first time in years that they have increased their rates at a very minimum amount and they still provide great service and get done what needs to be done.	

			<p>I have to live within my budget; no one helps me out and I feel you need to do that as well instead of putting greed before people who can't afford the skyrocket hikes.</p> <p>Please consider a lower increase for 2023.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeanette Marquardt</p>
Deborah Hill	E-mail	RE: The proposed rate 2023 PSE rate hike	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</p> <p>Regarding PSE's proposed rate hike in 2023 of an average of 12.15% for residential customers, I would like to say that such a rate hike is completely unfair and ridiculous. Even if PSE had proposed a rate hike of something like 6.15%, I would still think this to be an unfair burden on Washington rate payers.</p> <p>PSE says that these rate hikes are to do things like decarbonize its energy systems to comply with state mandates as well as to recover some years of capital investments made on behalf of customers. I do not recall being asked to evaluate these investments and being allowed to vote on whether these investments made any sense. I do not understand how PSE can now come to its customers asking them to pay for PSEs investments. If they chose to make investments I would think they had also chosen to assume the cost of those investments; passing a fraction of those costs on to their customers might be reasonable but this looks like they are just wanting their customers to outright pay for their business decisions. I say no.</p> <p>Further, PSE should be responsible for budgeting to do things like decarbonize its energy system which is what they should be doing anyway and not sticking it to rate and taxpayers for shortfalls in their business management.</p> <p>I understand that costs are going up for many things and I note that they propose rate hikes of 2.29% in 2024 and 1.82% in 2025 which seems reasonable and understandable. But at a time when inflation has eaten large holes in every household's budget and when there are ever fewer living wage jobs to be had and taxes are not going down, asking rate payers for a 12.15% rate hike for their natural gas is asking for too much, period.</p> <p>I would very much appreciate it if you recommend to PSE that they seriously revise their proposed rate hike downward.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>

			Sincerely, Deborah Hill Tacoma, WA
	Jocelyn Traber	E-mail	Please reconsider energy rate hike of 13-15% in 2023. This is not a match to inflation and places undue stress on us homeowners.
	Zachary Agnew	E-mail	The proposed 3 year plan proposed for electric and natural gas services that significantly increases the consumers costs is a terrible idea. With the soaring gas prices, inflation, poor economy, downward trending stock market, the middle class is already stretched toooooo thin. Most in the middle class have had to cut many conveniences out of our lives and are struggling to maintain. It's nice that PSE wants to increase their profits from 9.4 to 9.9, but this is literally the worst time to do so. When did local companies start putting profits before the community?  Zachary Agnew
	Linda Standish	E-mail	Good Afternoon,  Most customers have agreed and adapted to previous increased, but this year the increase appears to be greatly increased.  With Bellingham wanting to go completely green (electric) with our city, I think your customers need to hear an explanation. With a green city, your company will have little to no competition.  With all the additional expenses that folks are having to adjust, I think its only reasonable to maintain rates or apply the 1-2 per cent increase.  Thank you for your time.  David and Linda Standish
	Dr. Philip E. Cassady	E-mail	To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, I would like to comment on the requested Puget Sound Energy electrical rate increase (Docket UE-220066). I realize that Puget Sound Energy needs to operate a profitable company, but the requested rate increases are excessive. The requested 13.59% increase in rates for the year 2023 is not reasonable during these times of high inflation and potential business recession. It is quite out of line with the requested rate increases of 2.41% in 2024 and 1.8% in 2025.



			<p>Furthermore, the excessive rate increase requested in 2023 falls more heavily on the residential customers than the requested rate increases for subsequent years. The residential customers bear 116% of this excessive 2023 rate increase, and 109% of the requested 2024 rate increase, and 102% of the requested 2025 rate increase.</p> <p>The reasons given for these rate increases are not realistic. The more than four years of capital and operating investments were not made solely on behalf of the customers. Such capital investments are normally made to improve the returns of the investors. It is not reasonable to expect that upcoming capital investments and operating costs will be so heavily loaded into the first year of this three year plan.</p> <p>I request that this rate increase be rejected and a more realistic and reasonable Puget Sound Energy rate plan be approved by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.</p> <p>Dr. Philip E. Cassady</p>
	Rhonda and John Bolton		<p>I feel the proposed rate hike is too steep especially considering the usual increase of 1-2%.</p> <p>I have a Notice of Requested Changes to PSE Rates and Public Hearings. In short, they want to increase power rates by 13.6% - 15.8% beginning Jan. 1, 2023.</p> <p>Thank you, Rhonda and John Bolton</p>
	Myron Berg	E-mail	<p>UTC,</p> <p>Every year PSE comes to the trough to ask for more and more money for gas and electric and every year our rates increase.</p> <p>The outrageous requests for double digit increases for 2023 for gas and electric will only serve to escalate the already out of control inflation which remains steadily on the increase.</p> <p>We can do without some things and cut back on other things but utilities used to live life should not be compromised .</p> <p>We currently watch our usages very closely and will not be able to cutback on gas and electricity any further.</p> <p>We are seniors on fixed income and cannot afford these requests for double digit increases. PSE is a privately owned foreign utility ( which should never have been permitted to take place) and they are motivated by profit only with no regard for the interests of the citizens who must foot the bill.</p> <p>Deny the requests for the requested increases please !!!</p>

			<p>The Berg Family</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>
Suzan Ellis	E-mail	<p>This rate increase affects low income and middle-income households. This is going to be too much burden placed on households. We shut off our lights, use LED's, heat only to 68 degrees in the winter and cool to 74 degrees in the summer. I have a small house. We wear sweaters or hoodies in the winter to save money. Our bill estimate per month is \$193. This is ridiculous.</p> <p>Where is the revenue \$310 million from power and \$143 million in gas going? Update system, trim trees that people have called in about for over 15 years because the branches are pushing down on power lines, replace transformers, make sure street lights do not stay on 24 hours a day? When looking at the salary of the CEO's of PSE, I am sure the money goes back into their pockets. \$5 million salary for one person, \$4million for another, \$3 million for yet another, etc</p> <p><a href="https://www1.salary.com/PUGET-SOUND-ENERGY-INC-Executive-Salaries.html">https://www1.salary.com/PUGET-SOUND-ENERGY-INC-Executive-Salaries.html</a> PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC Executive Salaries &amp; Other Compensation - Salary.com</p> <p>The proxy statement's main purpose is to alert shareholders to the annual meeting and provide them information about the issues that will be voted on during the annual meeting, including decisions such as electing directors, ratifying the selection of auditors, and other shareholder-related decisions, including shareholder-initiated initiatives.</p> <p>www1.salary.com</p> <p>We need an accounting of where this money is going now and for the future. PSE is not making good budget decisions and they are making the peons pay.</p> <p>No to this rate increase</p> <p>Suzan Ellis</p>	
Janine Richardson	E-mail	<p>Thank you for opportunity to send concerns regarding tentative action. PSE is a monopoly for our power here in Puget sound and beyond to a point. Understanding that PSE is a business yet monopoly combined makes rate hikes request almost humorous. As with any business costs of anything and everything fluctuate hence so do profit. People/consumers are curious as to profit associated with PSE as well as rate hikes. Myself being included. Where does an average person find out information on this topic please? What % of profit is carried over from fiscal year to next to deter rate hikes.</p>	

			Thank you for your time.
Daryl Lambert	E-mail	<p>I would like to express my feelings on the proposed rate increases. I think that a jump of 13.59% for electricity and 12.98% for gas in 2023 is far too much. That can be spread over the three years when the rates are not so high. People are being taxed out of their homes with the increases in property values and now paying utilities that were once the amount of a car payment are just too much in addition.</p> <p>We do want to say that we are satisfied with the good service of PSE and they came quickly to my house when we had a gas leak.</p> <p>I also think that you should have retired or senior and disabled discounts as they do not get salary increases to keep up with these rate increases.</p> <p>As you go more to solar, you might want to help seniors get off the grid and be able to contribute to the power supply so they can also make some income. I know you offer these types of services but you need to be more proactive in assisting seniors who may not be able on their own to navigate the paperwork and understand how it all works. That would be a win-win for the power companies in getting more green energy and having seniors/disabled/retired have another source of income as well as reduced or no charges on their bill.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p> <p>Kathy and Daryl Lambert 425 260 7866</p>	
Wei Wang	E-mail	<p>The proposed Puget Sound Energy rate increase will be a financial shock to many families' budget under an already battered economy on the edge of a recession and will negatively impact the affordability of their basic energy needs. Puget Sound Energy should first explore options to operate more efficiently and reduce unnecessary expenses before asking for any rate increases. Also, any reasonable rate increase should be done gradually over several years so people can have the time to make financial adjustments to accommodate the higher energy cost without suffering hardship. Thank you very much for protecting and advocating for the interest of our community.</p> <p>Best regards, Wei</p>	

	Ali Naini	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to protest the proposed 15% rate increase by Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>This is corporate profiteering and should not be approved.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts on our behalf.</p> <p>Ali Naini Kirkland, WA</p>
	Lawrence Braun	E-mail	<p>Sir or Madam,</p> <p>In reference to Docket UE-220066, I must oppose these proposed rate increases. specifically bullet points 3, 5 and 6 on page 1 of the Notice of requested changes to PSE rates and public hearings dated Jan. 31, 2022. I feel all capital and operating investments (pts. 3 &amp; 5) should be borne by the owners of the company, regardless of whom the rate increase supposedly benefits. I have a feeling it will be PSE.</p> <p>An increase to PSE's authorized return on equity (pt. 6) seems to be pure greed. While almost everybody in the country is losing money on investments and equity, PSE wants an increase to 9.9% (I lost 6% on investments last quarter), using their customers hard earned money to pay for investments and then earn more money on those same investments. If I put up money for capital investments, I want a return on my money. I can see an increase to cover pts. 1,2 and 4, but not nearly 20 percent! I write in opposition to these rate increases.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, L.D. Braun</p>
	Stephen Nielsen	E-mail	<p>July 25, 2022</p> <p>Comment on proposed Docket UE-220067 , Natural Gas</p> <p>Rate increases are justified when contextual to realistic expenses. This proposal is not realistic. The proposed increase of 12.98 per cent in 2023, another 2.29 increase above the prior year in 2024 and another proposed increase of 1.82 of the prior year's increase does not, without careful justification, meet the threshold of a rational business model.</p> <p>PSE informs customers that rate adjustments are needed for several reasons.</p> <p>“To continue to provide safe and reliable service.” What will the increase do to achieve that goal? What data exists to show unsafe service and how specially will an increase be used to lessen risk?</p>

			<p>“To decarbonize it energy systems...” That work is needed and necessary. However, the work is capital dependent. Will the utility use rate increase revenues to support a bona fide capital expense? What other tools are available to address the need at lower cost? Capital needs can be bonded and utilized at lower cost than the current 9.4 return on equity. If PSE did that while enjoying the proposed rate hike, they will profit even higher from the difference of Bond expense to the Revenue increase.</p> <p>“To recover increased operating costs.” One does not recover increased cost. Whoever wrote that line does not understand finance. Has PSE had prior years of negative financial performance? If so, they are seeking to recover past loss. Every investor would be delighted if their past investments could be bolstered and increased against past reality. I trust you will pursue such sloppy thinking including conjecture on the part of PSE.</p> <p>“To set rates for a multiyear rate plan that reflect upcoming capital investments and operating costs over a three-year period.” With proper forecasts and documentation, PSE may have a case for some amount of rate increase. Please do not take their assessments and projections on face value. As a customer, I need and want their service. I have no choices outside of PSE. I and others need their service. Yet, they are bound as a regulated monopoly to a different standard above creating highly attractive investments.</p> <p>“To increase PSE’s authorized return on equity from 9.4 to 9.9%” Well above averaged inflation the proposed increases will benefit investors over customers. Monopolistic Utilities should not be able to make high profits at the expense of hurting customers and eventually themselves.</p> <p>Please do not accept the proposed docket’s remedies to PSEs perceived desires.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Stephen Nielsen A PSE customer</p>
	Len Nelson	E-mail	<p>Attention to whom it may concern @ Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Washington Attorney General's Office</p> <p>While there is always justification for additional operating funds ie, wage increases, increased material costs etc etc. There is NO</p>

			<p>justification in PSE's request for a 13.59 % increase in 2023 that also includes a residential overall average increase of 15.80 %. Yikes.</p> <p>The first word that comes to mind is "Criminal". With the current economy under a prodigious inflation burden and stock and bond markets in turmoil I'm sure we would all like such a windfall. As a retiree on a fixed budget I know I am not alone in protesting this flagrant request.</p> <p>It also appears PSE hopes the Commission and others fail to read all of the reasons there is such a request. At the bottom of the list is the "need" to increase the return on equity to 9.9%. Right in the ballpark with the S &amp; P 500. Most investment managers would love such a return in the current market. Heck I would be overjoyed at the current rate of 9.4% that PSE enjoys.</p> <p>The customers need all of you to deny the current request and require Puget Sound Energy to return to the drawing board.</p> <p>PSE could start by explaining the more reasonable increases for 2024 and 2025 that (by their own request) seem sufficient &amp; manageable.</p> <p>Regards, Leonard Nelson Des Moines, WA</p>
Michael Ives	E-mail		<p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission: These comments refer to: UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>My family recently received a notice from Puget Sound Energy stating they intend to request “An overall 13.56% increase in rates” in 2023 in order to make an “additional” \$310,600.000.00 selling electricity and, similarly, 12.98% increase selling natural gas.</p> <p>PSE is informing us the reasons they have to increase rates are that, essentially, there are some costs of doing business and they want to enrich their “stockholders”. First, a utility providing a necessity to the public should not be concerned about stockholders. Price hikes like this are among the reasons why a utility should be run by the government, or regulated to within an inch of its life.</p> <p>If wages are rising at all, they have been woefully behind the increase in the cost of living-even before</p>

			<p>the Pandemic. The Puget Sound has been a very expensive place to live for a long time. Wages have not reflected that ever. Now, on top of that, a private utility wants to just make more profit with the worst inflation I've seen in all my life (57y.o.). PSE is claiming they need to pay for “decarbonization”, recouping capitol investments and operating costs. A capitol investment should have had a return. We should be asked to pay less because of these capitol investments not more. PSE just needs to find another way to pay for these things if they truly need them. They can tighten their belts like everyone else. They don't have to pay dividends and they can make less profit because they have to pay the costs of doing business. That's just realistic and rational.</p> <p>WUTC, dose PSE make outrageous requests like this so you'll offer a compromise which would still be more than they need? Your counter offer should be nationalization. Better yet, don't offer, just do it.</p> <p>The Ives Family        Shoreline, WA</p>
	Gerald and Gail Dugan	E-mail	*** See Attached PDF***
	Dennis Patnaude	Mail	*** See Attached PDF ***
	Ronna Cunningham	E-mail	<p>To whomever:</p> <p>In this time of the highest inflation rate in the past 40 years (9.9%), I urge you to re-evaluate your need to inflate the price of energy. I suggest you freeze all price increases for 3 years: then in the 4th year increase the electric service 1.2% and the natural gas 1.74%; in the 5th year increase the electric service 2.62% and the natural gas 2.19%. At the end of the 5th year, depending on the economy, re submit your outlandish request for double digit increases. You have a responsibility to your customers.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this        Ronna Cunningham</p>
	Christian Juenke	E-mail	<p>I received notice of PSE requesting a rate increase. I think it should only be granted if executive pay is capped at 17 times the lowest paid employees equivalent salary. They pay the CEO over \$5,000,000 in salary. CFO close to \$2,000,000. This is not ok.</p> <p>If they want more money to recover their investments then they should slash executive pay.</p> <p>Christian Juenke</p>

			PSE Customer
	Francis Warfel	E-mail	Why can't they average the increase over the three years. Like 6% a year instead of one big increase upfront. We can adjust to smaller increases more easily. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. Thank you. FW
	Heather Hibbert-Rime	E-mail	Hello,  I think the increase they are requesting is too high, extremely too high for the service they offer and what they charge already. Ridiculous! It's not a one time increase, they want to increase for three consecutive years. When the power goes out during weather extremes, we are out for incredibly long times. Days and days. I live near state offices, fire and police . I don't see the money going to improving systems or to putting more money towards solar and wind power on cities..., where all customers could benefit from a percentage off their bills based on city solar and wind products and devices being used in the community, not just used on single residential, but on city buildings and businesses where's everyone benefits. Please don't allow the increase, especially not what they are asking for. It's too much. If they need to recover funds, look to the federal government, not off the back of current customers who pay their bills on time and in full. Sincerely, Heather HibbertRime
	Peter Tountas	E-mail	A proposed increase of 17% for Electric Service and a proposed 17% increase for Natural Gas over the next three years is totally unacceptable. It seems that it is much easier to increase prices that to figure out a way to decrease prices, simply because it takes far less effort. Clearly this is a severe blow to senior's who have spent their entire career paying every kind of tax conceivable, and now faced with the worse inflation in decades.  When there is a monopoly, such as Puget Sound Energy, we have no alternative source for power. We depend upon the UTC to bring some sort of sanity to these absurd increases. As senior retired persons, my wife and I have no other choice but to cut our charitable donations by the same amount as the increases. Sorry it has to be that way, but we enjoy eating and getting medical care.  Peter Tountas
	Kimberly Sims	Mail	***See Attached PDF***



	Darlyn M. DelBoca	Mail	*** See Attached PDF***
	Ellen Schug	Mail	*** See Attached PDF***
	Vivian Dorsett	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would like these comments/feedback documented and presented to the UTC with regard to PSE's proposed rate hikes to the electric and natural gas services for 2023 and through 2025, on January 31, 2022.</p> <p>The account holder for these services, in the 98055 area, is a senior citizen who is living on a fixed income. Due to the current economic situation, approval of rate increases of this magnitude will be crippling for those who are barely able to live right now.</p> <p>I would hope that PSE would take this fact into consideration and look into alternatives that will not adversely affect seniors and families, as this is NOT the time for yet another attempt to price gauge consumers who are struggling to make ends meet on a daily basis.</p> <p>PSE's rate hikes, if approved, would increase annually as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electric services:       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2023 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$174.36</li> <li>o 2024 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$207.60</li> <li>o 2025 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$208.91</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Natural gas services:       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2023 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$110.28</li> <li>o 2024 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$132.60</li> <li>o 2025 - Annual cost would be increased to approximately \$150.72</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>By 2025, the cost of electric and natural gas services would cost over \$75/year for the average PSE customer, which could potentially prevent people's ability to pay rent/mortgage, buy food and/or take care of their medical expenses!</p> <p>This is a HORRIBLE way for PSE to treat their customers, right on the heels of the worst time in history (e.g., pandemic, recession)!</p> <p>Thank you,        An Extremely Concerned Consumer</p>
	Kathy Knobbe	E-mail	I recently received notice that Puget Sound Energy is proposing a rate hike

		<p>I openly object to this rate hike!</p> <p>1). PSE of course should continue providing safe reliable energy service. This is what we are already paying them for!</p> <p>Perhaps they need to replace power lines and equipment. This should already be part of their budget and planning to do so. No more from me!</p> <p>2). Decarbonize? Yes of course. This is not new. Don't ask for more money. As you decarbonize, the expenses of carbonized power will be eliminated. Decarbonized energy often comes with more self sufficient renewable energy requiring much fewer employees and equipment. To decarbonize they will acquire more more efficient methods at a lower cost. More money? No!</p> <p>3). Recover capital investments? First of all, again-they should use their profits for such things, even when mandated to do so. Budget After all, you gotta spend money (your own, not ours) to make money</p> <p>4). Recover increased operating costs. How about we recover increased salaries of it's high salaried individuals in the company? I don't get to recover increased cost of electricity! No, I have to give up my health to recover. That is just great!</p> <p>5). Upcoming capital investments and operating costs. Again——budget for it! Don't ask users to pay so company and stock holders can not have to pitch in. You gotta spend money (yours, not ours) in order to make money</p> <p>Good grief! When all the cars, households and businesses go all electric, they will have all kinds of money rolling in! I seriously doubt our rates will decrease as their profits increase.</p> <p>6)). Increase profit return? ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!</p> <p>A nearly 20%increase, over three years. 15.8 % in the first year !!!</p> <p>As a person on limited income (social security and due to disabled no way to earn more) I cannot afford such increases. I can barely afford living now. I have been working on eliminating expenses and spending in all areas. Why should PSE not be required to do the same?</p> <p>Residential customers paying a higher percentage than the overall? What the heck. Why shouldn't any increase be equally spread across the board without burdening one class of users more or less than others</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Our economy will continue to slide as we are being asked to pay more and more. 20% is a lot more!!</p> <p>It is my hope that the WUTC will see through their request for more money for what it is. Greed! Greed at our expense while attempting to put all costs upon us and shrink from their moral and ethical obligations to work within a budget, or use their own money</p> <p>Yes. I object to any increase!</p> <p>Kathy Knobbe</p>
	Bonnie Connor	E-mail	<p>All I can say is YIKES!. I just don't know how people are supposed to survive without 25% pay hikes or Social Security raises. This will only increase homeless people. I can see raising rates some, but not to this extreme.</p> <p>Bonnie Connor Maple Valley WA</p>
	Natalie Williams	E-mail	<p>The docket number for my comment is Docket UE-220066 Puget Sound Energy Washington State Thank you, Natalie Williams</p> <p>----- Forwarded message ----- From: Natalie Williams &lt;natalieibclc@gmail.com&gt; Date: Thu, Jul 28, 2022, 7:55 PM Subject: Puget Sound Energy Rates To: &lt;comments@utc.wa.gov&gt;</p> <p>Dear UTC, Please help us keep our electric rates stable as we are having a hard time affording our many bills during this time of inflation and high housing costs. An increase would increase our suffering. I also am having a hard time and have not fully returned to work post having COVID.</p> <p>Thank you for listening, Natalie Williams</p>

			Washington State King County
	Wes Corey	E-mail	<p>These comments are referring to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. I have two major issues with the proposed utility increases. First, this is no time for PSE to be greedy and increase the profit that they're allowed; current profit levels are more than sufficient. Second, the increase that they're asking for in the first year is too high. That needs to be spread across the three year period; not front-loaded so much. Additionally, the increased profit percentage should be subtracted from the requested increases.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Wes Corey DuPont, WA</p>
	Lydia Bartholomew	E-mail	<p>I believe the initial year rate increases requested by PSE are unsubstantiated and will cause hardship to many. I consider myself fortunate compared to others and it will be difficult even for me. Every person and every business had a difficult time during the pandemic and had to make investments in their families, homes and businesses that were not reimbursed.</p> <p>A modest increase seems much more appropriate.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Lydia Bartholomew</p>
	Jody Disney	E-mail	<p>I am a resident of Olympia, WA in Thurston Cty. My PSE bills are already too high. I have updated my home &amp; that of my daughter to reduce energy consumption as much as I can afford - however these costs are eating up too much of my monthly income. Last winter I spent over \$500 per month to heat these two homes (my daughter cannot afford this on her income).</p> <p>Adding a 10% increase to their desired gain is disgusting. Who gets 10% on their savings? Not me! How are we, the consumers able to afford this kind of increase? More people will be homeless and using government subsidies so this giant company can pay its investors! Disgusting and unjust behavior.</p> <p>Jody A Disney</p>

	Catherine Adams	E-mail	<p>I thought PSE was required to become a non-profit when they took over Washington Natural Gas, I remember writing against that purchase a very long time ago. Still disappointed in the sale going through....I've always found PSE to be money hungry regardless of the economy.</p> <p>What has changed that they are trying so hard to make such large profits?</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Catherine Adams</p>
	Vendors Award	E-mail	<p>I note PSE's request for a nearly 20% rate increase. While it's understandable given PSE's energy mix which is heavily reliant on fossil fuels, all of which have increased in price, the lack of investment in renewables is not understandable.</p> <p>I understand that energy costs will have to go up in line with inflation, but relying on fossil fuels for electrical generation not only requires me to use more electricity through the climate change it causes, but also subjects both ratepayers and PSE shareholders to unstable, unpredictable costs. If PSE is granted a rate increase, they should be required to diversify away from fossil fuels and towards renewable sources of energy so costs can be more stable and predictable.</p> <p>I also note that in our area, PSE has reduced its frequency of tree trimming which reduces service reliability and likely increases overall costs. We have all seen the results when California utilities allowed deferred maintenance to pile up - horrific wildfires, service interruptions and utility bankruptcies. I realize that the labor market is currently challenging, but PSE should also be required to invest in adequate maintenance if it is granted a rate increase.</p> <p>All too often, utility rate increases go directly into the pockets of utility shareholders. In this case, if a rate increase is granted, the money should go towards investments in network diversification and maintenance. Part of the bargain investors make in buying the stock of a monopoly utility is to expect a relatively small, fair and stable rate of return, versus outsize stock price growth driven by juiced quarterly earnings. In the Pacific Northwest, we need to think and plan more than one corporate quarterly earnings cycle at a time. The UTC must require utilities to do so.</p>
	Elisabeth Mason	E-mail	<p>Good Day PSE,</p> <p>I've been a great customer of yours, and one who always pays your bills as soon as I receive them.</p> <p>I'm in shock about the news of PSE increasing Electric rates in 2023 to 15.80% - this huge increase is</p>

			<p>unacceptable, and even more so given our out of control inflation. Unfortunately, my wages have remained and will remain the same.</p> <p>I understand that increases happen, but not at 15.80 % !</p> <p>A 1.50% per year is both doable and more acceptable.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Elisabeth Mason PSE acct # 2200 2647 2054</p>
	Melanie Drescher	E-mail	<p>We agree with our WA AG Ferguson, we cannot afford to pay anymore for our utilities than we are paying now. We are on a fixed retirement income. We can't afford to even buy the same amount of groceries anymore. The higher grocery prices, due to the gasoline increases which grocery stores are passing on to customers, are really nothing more than price gouging by oil companies. Now the utility companies want to increase their profits as well as lining stockholders pockets and the pockets of their CEO's.</p> <p>WE can't afford to pay anymore. We even looked at switching to PSE's option of getting our electricity from "green" companies, thinking it would save us money. But NO, PSE wants to charge us more for choosing renewable energy. The only thing PSE wants to do is make more money. They are not concerned about our ability to pay for it. Everyone is hurting. The war in Ukraine has caused huge global supply chain issues for everything from gasoline to chips.</p> <p>We cannot afford to pay anymore than we already pay for utilities and groceries if we still want to able to live in our home. We cannot work anymore, we are on a fixed retirement income. Many people are out of work. This is NOT THE TIME for big utility companies to increase their profits on the backs of retired and working Washingtonians. We say NO to Price Increases for PSE Utilities.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Richard &amp; Melanie Drescher Olympia, WA</p>

	Mary Ann Lebold	E-mail	<p>I object to approval of PSE's requested 2023, 2024 and 2025 rate adjustments to provide electric service and natural gas service. PSE has a poor track record in providing reliable service. I would not want to pay more unless I were certain the service would improve.</p> <p>Mary Ann Lebold</p>
	Jennifer Godfrey	E-mail	<p>Thank you for all of your work.</p> <p>I am submitting comment about rate increases by PSE. I am a PSE and scl customer and both of the companies do not need to be increasing anything. SCL has jacked up prices extremely during the pandemic, and while they are not included on this comment, I would like to submit that for future consideration. During the pandemic, myself and many others noticed that our bills were about 30% higher without a change in usage.</p> <p>As far as PSE, their rates have been extremely high the entire time I've lived in Seattle and I see no reason for them to raise them. I also don't think that countries outside of the US should be determining our electric and gas rates. This is economic warfare.</p> <p>Thank you so much for soliciting public opinion and for all of your amazing work. We are lucky to have your office representing us in Washington.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Godfrey 98199</p>
	Richard & Penny Swymeler	E-mail	<p>Dear Members of the W.U.T.C.;</p> <p>While I understand the importance of companies to keep up with the price of inflation, I am discouraged that Puget Sound Energy is requesting to have a 12.98% increase in Natural Gas for the fiscal year 2023. I am not opposed to the increased of 2.29 in 2024 &amp; 1.82 in 2025 – as those rates are within the historic rate-of-inflation that many retired citizens planned for their golden years.</p> <p>The problem is Why should Puget Sound Energy only be looking at the outcome of their shareholders vs the citizens of the State of Washington who have to pay these continuing exorbitant prices for Natural Gas and Electricity.</p> <p>The corporation gets all kinds of tax benefits, deductions and such. The average citizen of the City of Seattle can hardly afford to live in their homes. As a senior citizen who has spent my entire life in this State, I am now being outpriced by people who make 3 times the salary that I did. I was able to purchase an affordable home in Seattle in the mid 1970's. If I had to do it all over again, I would NOT be able to purchase my home which is tax valued at over 1 million. Why should I carry the burden of increased costs.</p>

			<p>If Puget Sound Energy wants to increase prices to customers, I believe they should NOT look at their shareholders, but look at the demographics of those individuals who made this community and state what it is today. There should be some type of graduated scale of pricing based upon the persons income and ability to pay.</p> <p>If the WUTC agrees to these rate increases – I can do nothing else except leave the state that my family has called home since 1909 and let some other person or person(s).</p> <p>The plethora of reasons used to justify the rate increase – does not consider what “Joe Average” makes as a salary or “Annie Retirement” makes in retirement.</p> <p>It’s corporate greed and the only profit is the stockholders of the corporation.</p> <p>We oppose this rate increase.</p>
	Jenny Chan	E-mail	<p>Hi UTC,</p> <p>This is ridiculous that PSE wants to have a 10% profit margin and most likely the reality is more because this is based on their math. In times of high inflation, they are trying to profit even more from the people who need it most. PSE rates are already higher than what Seattle City Light is charging and since moving to a PSE controlled region, I have been unhappy with what they are charging.</p> <p>Why should the consumer be the one to offset the cost of their upgrades to "clean energy" when they are the ones taking the profits?</p> <p>-- Thanks, Jenny Chan</p>
	PSE Customer	E-mail	<p>Sirs, Short comment on energy increase requests:</p> <p><b>REJECT!</b></p>



			<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DO NOT SUPPORT THE GREED FACTOR TO INCREASE SHAREHOLDERS PROFITS</b> (return on equity)</p> <p>Thank you, PSE customer.</p>
	Carole Teshima	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of my family regarding the proposed utility rate hikes. We are a family of 3 struggling to live in east King County on one fixed retirement income, one full-time and one part-time teaching income. Our power bill on the budget plan increased from \$180 to \$240 a month beginning this month at the same time our rent increased from \$2800 to \$3000 a month. We had 2 catch-up PSE bills, last month and the month before of an extra \$500 total. We are stretched so thin because of all the other increases in fuel and food costs that I literally live in fear of homelessness. Not everyone works for Microsoft or Amazon. I have no idea where the poor service workers live, because I have searched constantly for more affordable housing within commuting distance to no avail.</p> <p>Please consider seriously the impact these rate increases have on what used to be middle class families, who are quickly becoming lower class. Without rent control or other lower cost housing options, there is no way we can afford any higher utility bills.</p> <p>I thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me at any time.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
	Gary Robertson	E-mail	<p>I agree with WA State Attorney General Bob Ferguson that the proposed electric rate increase for 2023 of \$16 per month is not fair, reasonable and just. Right now WA residents are financially strained by a number of factors including high inflation. The last thing we need is an exorbitant rate increase by our utility provider. If the increase was approved, their profits would soar to almost 10% which is outrageous. I urge you to deny their rate increase and if they are granted a rate increase, scale it back to something that is more reasonable, fair and just to all of us who live in WA.</p> <p>Gary Robertson Federal Way</p>
	John & Sally Mulcahy	E-mail	<p>We were stunned to see the huge rate increased requested by PSE from 2023-2025. An almost 16% rate increase in 2023 alone, and 20% over 3 years??!! That is an exorbitant amount to increase what the</p>

			<p>consumers pay. We are retired and on a fixed income, and to say that is a huge strain on the budget is an understatement. Also, people that are working certainly don't get wage increases to come close to that amount. Why does this corporation get to increase its profits while the consumer continually loses. Maybe they should lower the rate so we (the consumer) see the same rates to match PSE's increase in profitability, rather than a huge deficit to our budget. Please be an advocate for the consumer and do NOT grant this huge rate increase.</p> <p>John &amp; Sally Mulcahy Clinton, WA</p>
	Phyllis Woodward	E-mail	<p>As a retired senior I am tired of rate increases from utilities, garbage services and on and on. No one is raising my social security to cover these increases. Fed up.</p>
	Beth Sellars	E-mail	<p>I am writing in regard to the repeated rate increases that Puget Sound Energy is requesting from the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. This request requires its ratepayers to help bail out the debts that PSE incurs through their inattentive management, such as the natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood area in 2016.</p> <p>PSE records showed their broken gas service line was abandoned in 2004. PSE failed to properly disconnect and seal the line, allowing it to remain in service for nearly 12 years without proper oversight, the report said. PSE agreed to pay at least \$1.5 million in penalties for this disaster.</p> <p>Additionally offensive in their reasoning includes "...meeting the expectations of customers and stakeholders." Bottom line: The public ratepayers are once again expected to financially satisfy the money backers.</p> <p>And finally, NO mention of projected plans to introduce solar or wind to their operation, providing less expensive electrical rates.</p> <p>I, as a ratepayer, not a stakeholder, am very tired of corporate or public greed, always to the detriment of the tax or ratepayer. I urge the UTC to reject these requested changes.</p> <p>Thank you.        Beth Sellars</p>
	Bridget Foust	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to encourage you to please decline PSE's requested rate increase. The rate for electric and natural gas is already a MAJOR expense for many households, even those not struggling. A 13.59% increase</p>

			<p>would be detrimental to households trying to make ends meet. There is simply no need for these rate increases. PSE's profit margins are already high, there is no need to gauge customers. Please decline this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,          Bridget Foust</p>
	Deenah	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I received a letter detailing the proposed rate hike fee schedule for PSE recently and wanted to comment.</p> <p>As a single person with a meager single income, these proposed rate hikes will push me to a financial breaking point. I use my electricity and gas very conservatively as it is and still feel my bills, especially in winter with heat being used very sparingly, are absurdly too high.</p> <p>We are still not out of the woods with the pandemic, gas prices are out of this world and a recession is looming. Now is not the time to be hiking rates.</p> <p>As we've all seen at this point, most of these rate hikes mostly serve to benefit CEO and their ridiculous salaries.</p> <p>This 22 year PSE customer is vehemently against the proposed rate hikes and hope you will refrain from taking such action.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Sharon & Rich Reich	E-mail	<p>Prices here for there services are already too high!!!!</p> <p>Sharon &amp; Rick Reich</p>
	Jacquelyne Kinsey	E-mail	<p>I note PSE's request for a nearly 20% rate increase. While it's understandable given PSE's energy mix which is heavily reliant on fossil fuels, all of which have increased in price, the lack of investment in renewables is not understandable. I understand that energy costs will have to go up in line with inflation, but relying on fossil fuels for electrical generation not only requires me to use more electricity through the climate change it causes, but also subjects both ratepayers and PSE shareholders to unstable, unpredictable costs. If PSE is granted a rate increase, they should be required to diversify away from fossil fuels and towards renewable sources of energy so costs can be more stable and predictable. I also note that in our area, PSE has reduced its frequency of tree trimming which reduces service reliability and likely increases overall costs. We have all seen the results when California utilities allowed deferred maintenance to pile up - horrific wildfires, service</p>

			<p>interruptions and utility bankruptcies. I realize that the labor market is currently challenging, but PSE should also be required to invest in adequate maintenance if it is granted a rate increase. All too often, utility rate increases go directly into the pockets of utility shareholders. In this case, if a rate increase is granted, the money should go towards investments in network diversification and maintenance. Part of the bargain investors make in buying the stock of a monopoly utility is to expect a relatively small, fair and stable rate of return, versus outside stock price growth driven by juiced quarterly earnings. In the Pacific Northwest, we need to think and plan more than one corporate quarterly earnings cycle at a time. The UTC must require utilities to do so.</p>
	<p>Frank Damiano</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>I'd like to say that this is price gouging. I don't feel like I am being treated like a customer I feel like I am being treated like profit margin. I understand you have to stay in business to provide the service but to expect me to provide additional interest feels like I am being charged interest on the principal and interest on the interest.</p>
	<p>Abby Haubrich</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>After receiving the notice of the requested rate increase, and the listed reasoning, I have the following questions/comments.</p> <p>Reason # 1 "To Continue to provide safe &amp; reliable energy service". - The number one reason for power outages is related to weather. A combination of wind &amp; rain or snow &amp; ice drastically increases the possibility of tree's falling on power lines. To make repairs during these weather conditions is not safe. Its also incredibly costly to pay for emergency repairs where labor rates increase into overtime rates. Its inefficient to address the most common cause of outages where the conditions are unknown.</p> <p>* Question I have is, what percent of PSE resources is dedicated to preventative care to reduce the most common cause of power outages? If more resources are dedicated to preventative maintenance, PSE should expect to have safer &amp; more reliable energy services.</p> <p>Reason # 2 "Decarbonize its energy system to comply with state mandates &amp; meet the expectation of customers &amp; stakeholders". - PSE's website states they have a goal to be "beyond net zero carbon" by 2045. If this goal was created by PSE to comply with state mandates &amp; stakeholder. Then PSE should look to the state &amp; stakeholders for means and methods on how to achieve it. PSE should place appealing incentives in place so that customers who also want to contribute to this goal can do so by making changes within their homes/business or to help finance this goal.</p> <p>* Washington state energy code is one of the most stringent in the US. PSE customers are required to pay far greater new construction &amp; remodels costs to achieve code requirement, then they would in any other state (with the exception of California). Equipment manufactures are also required to build water heaters, HVAC equipment and household appliances that meet energy code requirements which is also paid for by the homeowner. Question I have is, why does PSE expect their customers to repeatedly pay to meet the same code requirements?</p>

			<p>Reason # 3. "To recover more than four years of capital and operating investments made on behalf of customers and not currently included in PSE rates." - Investing is not a guarantee, which is why there is insurance for investing. If customers are required to pay to "recover", then PSE will need to issue a statement to each customer, on when &amp; how each customer benefited financially from previous years of investments.</p> <p>Reason # 4 "To recover increased operating costs." - No working citizen of Washington state could have guessed the rate of inflation, prior to requesting a raise from their employer. Why is PSE entitled to "recover" operating expenses when everyone else is required to reduce expenses to get by. PSE will need to reevaluate how they can reduce their own operating expenses.</p> <p>Reason # 5. "To set rates for a multiyear rate plan that reflect upcoming capital investments and operating costs over the three year period." Again, if PSE wants its customers to finance its investments, they need to provide information on how this financially benefits their customers. Otherwise, PSE stakeholders need to be willing to solely fund their investment out of their own profit margin.</p> <p>Reason # 6 "To increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%." - In the current condition of the US economy, this is a distasteful request to further burden their customers, when PSE is still turning profits.</p> <p>Thanks AH.</p>
	Jon Sutter	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I am OPPOSED to any rate increase from PSE.</p> <p>PSE has wasted millions for decades now on lawsuits and pointless studies instead of doing what was right and updating our dams. They have far exceeded the repair costs with legal fees. Until they can learn to respect consumers' hard earned money and make responsible choices they do not deserve the right to any more of our earnings.</p> <p>On top of their lack of financial management they are asking for an excessive amount. 15.80% when people are already getting hit with 9%+ inflation is inhumane. and will cause undue hardship on many Washingtonians.</p> <p>If PSE needs to increase cash flow, they should look at reducing their executive salaries.</p>

	Amy Motter	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am not pleased with the rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you, Amy Motter</p>
	Phil Rochelle	E-mail	<p>Utility Folks!</p> <p>The proposed increases are UNACCEPTABLE! We are already struggling in this economy and you are proposing to MAKE IT ALL WORSE! It's bad enough already!!</p> <p>16% is an IMMENSE INCREASE and is completely unreasonable! It is as if you are deliberately trying to force us to switch to candles.</p> <p>Small increases every few years are understandable. But this is ridiculous!</p> <p>Please do not allow this to happen to us,</p> <p>Phil Rochelle Port Orchard, WA</p>
	Sandie Maki	E-mail	<p>I cannot believe you would actually seriously consider allowing yet another increase in utility rates. Puget Sound Energy has already increased rates way beyond what is necessary.</p> <p>The cost of living is outrageously high and those of use on Social Security are scrambling to keep costs down as much as we can without starving.</p> <p>Get real. Puget Sound Energy is not just owned by non-American country (the last time I was able to track ownership), we are paying for stockholders to get richer.</p> <p>I am against any further rate increases.</p> <p>Sandra Maki Olympia, WA</p>
	Meg Maroney	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Meg Maroney and I am a resident of Redmond, WA. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when we are all struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month</p>

			<p>for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Meg Maroney Redmond, WA</p>
	Elizabeth Standal	E-mail	<p>I’m a Kirkland resident writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates. Consumers are currently struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, and it is unfair to impose excessive increases for a life-and-death necessity such as utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to prioritize the welfare of Washington residents, not PSE’s disproportionate profit margin. Do not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you. Elizabeth Standal</p>
	Ben Pecora	E-mail	<p>You guys are making a rate change again? This is ludicrous. Give us a break and give us incentive to SAVE and CONSERVE!!!</p> <p>Ben Pecora</p>
	Rachel Doyle	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Rachel Doyle and I am a resident at 362 Bellevue way ne, apt n229, Bellevue,wa. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>-- Warm regards, Rachel Doyle</p> <p>Pronouns: she/her/hers</p>

			732-762-8612
	Christy Bear	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Christy Bear and I am a resident of Bellevue. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you. Christy Bear</p>
	Renee Coe	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Commissioners,</p> <p>The notice of requested changes to PSE's electric rates that was received with my last bill was shocking beyond words. For electric rates to increase by nearly 20% over the next 3 years is untenable for many customers who are already struggling with high inflation nationwide.</p> <p>Instead of PSE finding alternative sources of renewable energy to reduce rates, we, the customers are again being asked to accept the brunt of higher energy bills. My daughter who is 34 and living in a small 400 square foot studio apartment in Bellingham and paying nearly \$1,000 in rent said "I have another 50 years of this". When will we not be able to live because we can't afford to?</p> <p>As you weigh this important rate case decision presented by PSE, also ask yourself what your grandchildren will be able to afford in 5 years, 10 years, 20 years from now and why a 20% increase should be absorbed by the citizens of our state when so many hard working families are struggling with everyone wanting more from their paycheck.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. Renee Coe Point Roberts, WA</p>
	Deborah Gandolfo	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Commission</p> <p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people. PSE is a private company and already makes large profits.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you. Deborah Gandolfo</p>



	Kelli Keeley	E-mail	<p>As a retired employee of PSE’s contractor. I have first hand knowledge of the waste that goes on between both companies that eventually we as consumers pay for in our monthly bills. As of right now MOST buildings PSE has are not occupied by even 10 percent of their employees, since covid Employees were given the option to permanently work from home, and still are. But...PSE is still paying for the properties. Also as a former contractor employee, I do know that the office employees of the contractor thru all of covid were still occupying their buildings and being paid with NO employees in the field producing any work. Field workers were home. Therefore there was no processing of paperwork needed. But employees were being paid to be there to do nothing. All of these costs are put on the consumer at some point. Just another example of Big Business getting away with things.</p> <p>Thank you for listening.</p>
	Susan Seykota-Smith	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>We strongly oppose further rate increases by Puget Sound Energy. The company has regularly raised its rates over the past years, as have other utilities, including WAVE (Astound), Waste Management, and Kitsap Public Works (Sewer). In addition, prices for groceries and gasoline have soared, and property taxes hiked substantially. Meanwhile, my husband works as a helper clerk at Albertsons, and I have a fixed income on Social Security. We do not receive increases in our income to meet the increases in fees and rates. We ask that you do not approve the requested increases proposed by Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>Thank you,        Chris and Susan Seykota-Smith</p>
	Judy Redmond	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Judy Redmond, and I am a resident of Woodinville. I am calling/writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,        Judy Redmond</p>
	Arriba Stature	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is bad</p>

			<p>timing to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>This won’t just raise rates for PSE customers but for all energy consumers as well over time.</p> <p>Meanwhile what is PSE doing about finding more green energy or involving itself in home solar programs that would bring down energy costs?</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you, Arriba Stature Snoqualmie Washington 98065</p>
	Patricia Grohl	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Patricia Grohl and I am a resident of Redmond. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people. I am retired and on a fixed income. This increase would negatively impact my budget.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you. Patricia Grohl</p>
	Maryanne Johanson	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a resident of Sammamish, WA. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. Many residents are senior citizens like me. We are on fixed income and already have to keep our heat very low, keep lights off, and be cognizant of how much hot water we use, just to pay the PSE bill each month.</p> <p>Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for seniors and many other people. Please do not allow this increase.</p> <p>Maryanne Johanson</p>
	Robert C. Willison	E-mail	<p>PSE's requested rate increase in the "teens" seems a bit steep! Please consider that it would be desirable for increases not to exceed the COLA received by Social Security recipients.</p>

			Thank you for your consideration of this factor.
	Oolaa Kaplan	E-mail	<p>To the UTC Commission</p> <p>I'm writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair &amp; mean to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities.</p> <p>Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Oolaa kaplan Bellevue 98008</p>
	Thomas R. Vest	E-mail	<p>I write to express my concern over the effect of lower and middle income Washington residents on the proposed multi-year large rate increases. We consumers living in the real world have predicted that the wonderful "benefits" of the "green energy revolution" were going to cause massive hardships to the living standards of everyday people. The ideas of driven mostly by the elitists in the upper income brackets.</p> <p>Therefore, I propose that the UTC require further rate classifications for residential customers to partially subsidize these large increases for those living below the standards of these proponents. Two new tiers should be required; the first giving a full dollar credit for all power usage at the level of about 20% of normal historical average residential energy use; the second, a freeze on rates at current levels for the next 30% of average usage; the final tier should be a slight increase in the proposed rate to compensate for the anticipated revenue loss as just described. Those state residents whose have the luxury to be able to afford to purchase and charge up their \$60,000 Teslas should be willing to put their money where their mouth is. Secondly, I would object to the proposed 0.5% increase in PSE profit level at a time of economic hardship for state residents.</p>
	Dale O'Key	E-mail	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>RE: UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>Once again Puget Energy is asking for a rate hike, which they were just granted and enacted in 2021.</p> <p>Further their "estimates" of change are never even close to the actual impact customers experience. While their proposal indicates three tiers over three years, the amounts are staggering. Particularly to those of us who are retired and on fixed incomes.</p>

			<p>Puget Energy is using this monstrous rate hike to fund their "green energy" target without any regard to practicality, current grid structure and the affect it will have on customers.</p> <p>I am not opposed to working towards more green energy throughout this state; however, I am opposed to their political only approach, which has set an arbitrary target deadline. 16.34% (E) and 12.14% (G) in year one--2023--demonstrates GREED above all, which is then to be followed by two more years of rate hikes of 2.68%/1.23% (E) and 2.19%/1.74% (G) respectively.</p> <p>There are a great many Washingtonians, as you like to say, besides those on fixed incomes who simply will no longer be able to afford electricity...and the social consequences will be huge. We all know Washington has failed miserably in addressing the social consequences of hasty and poorly thought actions.</p> <p>Dale A. O'Key Puget Energy Customer 220014962827 Olympia, WA 98501</p>
E Gary Pina	E-mail		<p>I adamantly OPPOSE the requested rate increases! Seriously, the price of electricity from established equipment doesn't just increase 20% overnight! With the exception of a few windmills the balance of equipment has been paid for many times over. This is opportunistic price gouging and not only should it be rejected but PSE should be penalized for attempting ream their customers who don't have the ability to obtain power from other providers! JUST SAY NO!!!</p> <p>E Gary Pina Acct #200022729764</p>
Alina Zollfrank	E-mail		<p>Hi,</p> <p>Our family lives in Bellingham, WA. PSE just announced a rate increase of by 13.6% - 15.8% beginning Jan. 1, 2023. I can honestly say that while we've been committing to Warm Fund donations and have a small solar array on our 2-bedroom home, last winter's bills were already a stretch for our family. We're 2 adults, 2 teens and have one income only - my husband, who has been battling cancer this year. We kept our house at 65 degrees in winter (brrrr) and layered up but will not be able to pay our bills next time around if these drastic rate increases are put into place.</p> <p>PSE needs to remember that many local families are still struggling with Covid set-backs and no one's income has gone up by 15% this year. In our region especially, the discrepancy between income and cost of living is enormous. This increase will cause more poverty and - especially in our neighborhood with lots of</p>

			<p>older, sub-maintained homes relying on electrical heat - health issues, especially for the very young, elderly, and people with pre-existing conditions.</p> <p>Please work with PSE to make this sustainable and to prevent desperate neighbors from burning inappropriate items in fireplaces and backyard pits (this happened in our neighborhood last winter and the air quality was profoundly affected).</p> <p>Thanks, Alina Zollfrank</p>
	Jeff Bouma	E-mail	<p>I am against the amount of the proposed 14% - 16% rate hike in Jan 2023.</p> <p>This is MUCH higher than current inflation rates. This is also not in line with the push by Washington state to move to electric power vs fossil fuels.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeff Bouma</p>
	Elizabeth Harrisen	E-mail	<p>How are those of us on fixed income supposed to afford your proposed rate hike in January? I am so careful in my home not to waste energy because my budget is so tight. If you do this, is the city going to be able to help people like me keep warm this winter? (Weatherization waiting lists are long) Is there a reasonably priced program for help with installing solar? Heat pumps? I've be</p> <p>Elizabeth harrisen in Bellingham since 1986. There have been years that it has been a struggle; others not so much. Because of utility rate hikes (I understand that water is going to increase substantially as well), it looks like 2023 is going to be the one that finally drives me out. Seriously, please work with other city, county, state administrations to help seniors if you skyrocket our utilities. It's much less expensive for the body politic to have seniors stay in our homes than for the state to house us elsewhere.</p>
	Sandra Marsh	E-mail	<p>I am so glad we have the UTC to protect gas and electric customers from the proposed gouging by PSE.</p> <p>The proposed increases are really out of line. The reasons PSE gives are of little legitimacy. -Why would a rate increase provide safe and reliable energy service? Those two things have not changed as safety and reliable have always been foremost in any business. PSE is trying to create fear using buzz words. Will the employees not have a safe and reliable workplace if PSE does not get the increases? If that's the case then the UTC would need to put providing electricity and natural gas up for bid for a company that can</p>

provide safe and reliable services with out asking for increases each year. PSE needs to redo their budget and live within it as John Q Public has to. PSE lives in a dream world?

-PSE is not an American company so the money does not help our economy, rather it would further "enhance" our failing economy. CEO Mary Kipp's salary is \$5,300,000. Former CEO Kimberly Harris made \$5,029,000. And the list goes on, no one in the upper eschelon made less that \$1,000,000. This was in 2020, I can't find what they are making in 2022. More research needs to be done. Maybe PSE upper eschelon employees need to take a cut in pay rather than increase rates?

-The decarbonization of its energy systems to comply with state mandates and meet the expectations of customers and stakeholders? PSE has long known this was coming and should have set money aside for these mandates. And expectations of customers? I don't believe customers have expectations other than providing low cost energy and safety of its employees as it did before PSE went rogue. It doesn't make sense. Stakeholders? Well, if a person invests in stocks, bonds or utilities, surely stakeholders know investments are always a risk. If no one wants risk, then open a savings account.

-To recover four years of capital and operating investments made on behalf of customers not currently included in PSE rates. Was that PSE's choice to make these "investments"? If that's the case, then if it is accurate, bill those customers. If not, again, that sort of thing should have been built in their budget and not gouge customers.

-To recover increased operating costs. PSE has had many, many rate increases, where is the money they have received through these increases? Don't viable companies have operating cost increases built into their budgets? Seems that would be the logical and practical thing to do.

-To set rates for a multiyear rate plan that reflect upcoming capital investments and operation costs over the three year period. What three year period? Again, aren't these costs included in long range budget plans?

-To increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. I wish I had that on my equity investments.

PSE is not an American company anymore. Any increases as does the income generated with or without increases, go to the owners in Canada. Shareholders, stockholders, stakeholders all know all investments go up and down. So, why would we be asked to pay for that? Again, if a person wants a guaranteed rate of return, open a savings account or buy a CD.

PSE and other wind sourced utilities continue to receive tax credits and subsidies from the federal government. As of 2018 it amounted to \$100billion.

			<p>I realize PSE and most utilities don't usually get the exact amount of raise they ask for. I suppose that is to make the customers "feel better". But, it doesn't. This asked for increase is so over the top I cannot believe I read it. Does the UTC actually look at their expenses and liability sheets? There is a "rumor" that these big conglomerates have 3 sets of books: One for the customers, one for the IRS, and the "actual" book. Which one is presented to the UTC?</p> <p>One other thing: Please quit calling these INCREASES changes. Say it like it is, an increase.</p> <p>I do put my faith in this commission that it will turn this travesty down flat. America is in a big hurt right now economically. Now is not the time for PSE to gouge their customers. I do feel you will do the right thing you all were elected to do: Protect the people who elected you.</p> <p>Very sincerely, Sandra Marsh</p>
	Liz Johnson	E-mail	<p>I was absolutely shocked and mortified upon reading the insert included in my last PSE bill regarding PSE's request to raise electric service rates 15.8% and natural gas service rates 12.15% for residential customers in 2023. With the rising cost of groceries, gas and other necessities right now so many families are already operating on very thin margins...and now this? A rate hike this steep will literally require some families to choose between food or heat. Please use your conscience and DO NOT grant PSE's request for a rate increase this drastic.</p> <p>Thank you, Liz Johnson</p>
	Bruce Helm	E-mail	<p>My wife and I, like so many others, are on a fixed income and feeling the pinch of inflation on most everything. To tell us that you are about to raise our electric bill by 20% over 3 years is unconscionable. How can you continue to feed this companies coffers with a guaranteed 10% return on equity? Someone, somewhere cut a sweet deal at the public's expense. Please put a stop to this now.</p> <p>Thank you,  Bruce Helm</p>

	CR Henry	E-mail	<p>To the UTC board, I very strongly oppose the 20% / 16% rate increases for electric/ gas services as requested by PSE over the next 3 years due to the current economic condition of the Country (RECESSION heading for DEPRESSION). When the cost of power and fuel increase the price of everything follows suit and most of US are having a hard time with the 19.1% true inflation rate. A rate increase to cover fuel cost is warranted but no other increases for the current conditions. Thank You</p>
	Jack Giuliano	E-mail	<p>Commissioners,</p> <p>Regarding the proposed 2023 rate increase of 13.59 %, I would like the commissioners to reject this exorbitant amount. No customer should be subsidizing the 'green' switchover of power generation from proven, lower cost and acceptable pollution levels methods. The hidden costs of battery storage, wind generation maintenance, and other futuristic methods should be borne by for-profit companies, not utilities. To be noted is that the most vocal proponents, in our state, of 'green' energy have very large incomes and are not on Social Security fixed income.</p> <p>-- Jack Giuliano PSE customer</p>
	Bonnie Gretz	E-mail	<p>The proposed overall for residential customers rate hike of 15.80% is much too high, especially for one year! I understand the need to make adjustments, but this is way too high and will severely impact many customers of limited incomes. I urge the commission to reject this massive increase. Thank you, Bonnie Gretz</p>
	Brian & Sarah Six	E-mail	<p>A 15.80% increase for residential customers in 2023 is a huge jump. Many customers are already stressed with increased costs just when buying gas and groceries. This rate increase would be a great burden on many customers.</p> <p>Please kindly reconsider, Sarah Six</p>



	Jackie W.	E-mail	<p>This new purposed rate increase is absolutely ridiculous. People are already struggling to live with the cost of gas, groceries, and all other necessities. Property taxes and rent are through the roof. How do you expect people to afford these rates?! I'm completely against this in every way.</p>
	Tim Verschuyt	E-mail	<p>RE: Docket UE 220066</p> <p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>Please do not allow all of the proposed utility rate increases by Puget Sound electric.</p> <p>I understand that some commodities, such as aluminum and copper, are increasing and that cost needs to be passed on to the PSE consumer. But some of that increase in commodities is due to the hopefully temporary increase in fuel cost. As fuel cost drop a bit, hopefully these commodity prices will also decrease. In addition all of the existing PSE customers are already served by the existing infrastructure. Could PSE consider charging only new users that require upgrading the capacity of the infrastructure with higher rates.</p> <p>Also I've noted that the basic charge for electrical service has been increased by 10.7%. With many of the meters today automatically posting consumption without the expense of meter to meter inspection, is this 10.7% basic charge, no matter what consumption takes place, justified?</p> <p>At 77 years old, I'm doing all I can presently to be environmentally responsible with my utility usage. My income is from the stock market which recently fell by 25%. Meanwhile inflation increases. I have less funds to buy more expensive products. I don't know how much longer I will be physically able to heat my home with a wood stove.</p> <p>Please do closely analyze PSE's request for such a large utility increase. Do they really need to increase their return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9% as detailed in their recent Notice of Requested Changes? I certainly hope that you will determine if PSE's requested rate change is a result of justified need from an efficient operation, or is it simply jumping on the inflation bandwagon in order to profit more?</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tim Verschuyt</p>

	Brooke Boswell	E-mail	<p>Hello, we are loyal PSE customers who pay our bills on time. In this current economy, this rate change is too much! Why is PSE raising their return on equity? Passing along this to the consumer during this difficult time is not serving the community but is greedy. I do not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Brooke Boswell</p>
	Mark Jarmuth	E-mail	<p>Raising rates in the wake of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression is unconscionable. PSE and the Washington Democrats who prompted the rate hike have no conscience and are sworn enemies of Washington residents. Mark Jarmuth, jarmuthmark@gmail.com, 425-556-0916. I will support any movement, regardless of the political orientation of those who promote it, to privatize the delivery of energy services to the hardworking people of Washington.</p>
	Gerard & Eleanor Stromberg	Mail	<p>***See attached PDF***</p>
	Jeanne Pocock	Mail	<p>***See Attached PDF***</p>
	G. Robert Rohrbach	Mail	<p>***See attached PDF***</p>
	Betty McNiel	E-mail	<p>I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. PSE has not justified the extent of the rate increases they request. The Attorney General Office's experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified. PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent, which is too high. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,        Betty McNiel        Bellevue WA</p>
	Joan Gemmell	E-mail	<p>NO! NO! NO!</p> <p>ABSOLUTELY NO WAY. WE ARE IN THE MIDST OF A RECESSION (WHETHER SOME POLITICIANS WILL ADMIT IT OR NOT, WE ARE) FOR SO MANY OF OUR SENIORS THIS WILL BE A CASE OF" NO EAT IF YOU WANT HEAT."</p>

			<p>TOTALLY SCANDALOUS AT THIS TIME CONSIDERING THEY DID NOT MEET THREE OF THEIR GOALS IN OPERATIONS SERVICES. YEP, HEARD ALL THESE SORT OF EXCUSES BEFORE BLAH, BLAH, BLAH. EXCUSES, EXCUSES ALWAYS EXCUSES. WHEN I WAS WORKING IF THIS HAD BEEN MY END OF YEAR REVIEW THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN NO BONUS AND DEFINITELY NO RAISE, SO LET THIS BE THE SAME FOR PSE.</p> <p>LET'S SEE, DID ALL THOSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY GET THE SAME INCREASE IN PAYMENTS THAT PSE ARE LOOKING FOR, HECK NO. DID THE MANAGEMENT AT PSE TAKE A SALARY CUT BECAUSE THEY DID NOT MEET THEIR GOALS, AGAIN HECK NO. THEIR REVIEWS SHOULD READ PERFORMING BELOW EXPECTATIONS.</p> <p>IF THIS INCREASE IS APPROVED IT WILL CAUSE UNDUE HARDSHIP TO SO MANY PEOPLE, NOT TO MENTION THE TIMING COULD NOT BE ANY WORSE. THIS TRULY IS AN ABSOLUTE OUTRAGE AND EXCUSE THE PUN "AN ABUSE OF POWER"</p> <p>PLEASE FOR ONE MOMENT, TO THOSE OF YOU CONSIDERING THIS REQUEST FOR ONCE PLEASE PUT PEOPLE BEFORE "BIG BUCKS" AND DO THE RIGHT THING FOR THE COLLECTIVE GOOD.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Joan Gemmell</p>
	Samuel Rapoport	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Sam Rapoport and I am a resident of Kirkland I am calling/writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Samuel Rapoport</p>
	Lorie Lucky	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC members:</p> <p>my name is Lorie Lucky and I am a resident of Des Moines, WA. I am calling/writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p>

			<p>Our disabled, BIPOC and other vulnerable populations will be hit particularly hard. PSE is a private company making all its profits on energy supply and distribution, and reinvestment of profits on Wall Street - people in Washington State could be their own decentralized distributors if they had access to solar panels on all residences; PSE opposes individual citizen production of energy.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase. Without a state income tax, too many Washington State residents are struggling to stay sheltered as it is.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to my letter. We appreciate your work for Washington State citizens.</p> <p>Lorie Lucky PSE Customer, Senior Citizen</p>
	Sara Bhakti	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I oppose PSE's rate increase application. I don't think it is justified to increase their profit margin by so much. Rate increases should be tied to PSE's actual expenses plus a reasonable profit.</p> <p>I reside in Kirkland WA.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Sara Bhakti</p>
	Rosemary Moore	E-mail	<p>Members of the Commission,</p> <p>As a Washington resident and PSE customer, I write to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in gas and electric rates, beginning in 2023. It is unreasonable to impose such large increases for these utilities, particularly at a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services,. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>In addition, PSE is not doing nearly enough to move our electric supply to 100% renewable sources. Only a significant shift might justify such an increase.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the immediate and longterm welfare of Washington residents as well as PSE's heel dragging on changing to 100% renewable sources and deny this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Rosemary Moore</p>

	Patricia Paisley	E-mail	<p>I am a resident of Stanwood, WA. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Diana Antrim	E-mail	<p>Dear (pronoun of your choice, since that seems to be vitally important to some people),</p> <p>Concerning the requested Electric and Natural Gas Service rate increases proposed for 2023 and beyond, I implore you to reconsider and not approve the proposal as stated in recent communications to customers. The average of these increases for 2023 is a whopping 13.26%!!!!</p> <p>Inflation is over 8% currently and was 9.1% in June of 2022.</p> <p>Has the customer base's income increased 13.26% in the past year? Has it increased even 3.26%?</p> <p>As part of the aging middle class, these proposed rate hikes are WAY over-reaching people's ability to pay. Smaller, more gradual increases can usually be managed in a budget for NOT huge leaps!</p> <p>Please, please do reconsider this rate adjustment as we just cannot tolerate such abuse.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mrs. Diana Antrim PSE Customer Hansville, Washington</p>
	Cathy Harber	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Cathy Harber and I am a resident of Lake Forest Park. I am calling/writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. We are all struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, and it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people, including my family. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Cathy Harber</p>
	Roger T. Martin	E-mail	<p>Please accept this correction to a typo I made in the earlier comment.</p> <p>...sat through the hearings on the first lawsuit against the LNG facility, and I was very disturbed by the way</p>

the judge sustained almost every objection to the plaintiffs and overruled almost every objection to PSE and PSCAA.

Thank you,

Roger T. Martin

Dear UTC,

A few years ago, I was (and remain) proud to have participated in the movement to stop the development of the proposed methanol facility on the Tacoma Tideflats. The next thing we knew, PSE wanted to build a liquefied natural-gas refinery, storage, and delivery facility there. Despite breaking all the rules about building before getting permits, the clear violation of indigenous tribes' treaties, no advisory input from any real scientists, and widespread public disapproval, PSE, with the help of the supposed regulatory entity, the Puget Sound Clean Air Authority, spent multiple millions of dollars on media ads, and now that dangerous facility is running, albeit under an open lawsuit from the tribes.

I sat through the hearings on the first lawsuit against the LNG facility, and I was very disturbed by the way the judge sustained almost every objection to the plaintiffs and overruled almost every objection from PSE and PSCAA.

One of the big selling points for the facility was that it would provide storage for natural gas during periods when demand was high, thus providing likely lower customer rates because of the additional stability in supply. So, just like most intelligent and informed people probably predicted, PSE wants to increase rates. I am confident the AG's office has it right, and picking through the financials shows that the foreign-owned PSE doesn't deserve rewarding them with an increase in their profits destined for holding-company executives and investors.

Where is the justice and honesty in this whole PSE-PSCAA enterprise? Unlike PSCAA and the judge in the lawsuit, I hope these greedy and dishonest people at PSE don't get an undeserved free pass this time.

Thank you,

Roger T. Martin  
Mailing address: University Place  
Residence address: Steilacoom

	R. Jim Parkes	E-mail	<p>Hello... First, I hope you do not roll over. Many of us rate payers and probably most, cannot afford those kind of rate increases. Our incomes do not match, especially among the retired community. It seems to me that PSE's failure to capture previous capital costs and operating expenses within its current rate structure should not be borne by me and my fellow PSE customers. Like any well-run company surely they can achieve efficiencies, especially with electricity. The electric service request is actually higher than for natural gas, a traded and volatile worldwide energy commodity.</p> <p>So...Audit their justification. Make them prove the numbers and make them report on progress to justify the final agreement.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>R Jim Parkes 5220 90th Ave SE Mercer Island, WA 98040</p>
	Chris	E-mail	<p>Subject Dockets UE-220066/220067</p> <p>I want to be clear that rate increases NEED to be minimal and NECESSARY.</p> <p>In an attempt to be equitable to those who truly believe in this so called "green power" agenda I propose that these rate increases should primarily be put upon the shoulders of those that truly wish to have these more expensive power options.</p> <p>Those pushing wind and solar in the NW should have the option to check a box on their monthly bills to opt in to these new power generation options, and by doing so could show their true support by putting their money where there mouths are.</p> <p>I want, reliable, and inexpensive power. Period. Those that want to convert to these vastly more expensive technologies.....NEED to pay for them.</p> <p>Chris Tacoma</p>
	Kathy Wilson	E-mail	<p>I once again have gotten the news that rates are going up Every time we are "allowed" input but to no use ever! The reason I bother this time to write is the reason these rates are going up is the pressure to meet the backwards plans to "Green" the planet without any new affordable less damaging realistic plans in place</p>

			must you give in to this? Gas is green a good use of resources and you know it STAND UP now for us. TRY.
	Janet Kusakabe	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Janet Kusakabe and I am a resident of Bellevue, WA. I am writing to express my opposition to PSE’s proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people, especially retired residents like me.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.          Janet Kusakabe</p>
	Don Thompson	E-mail	<p>Hi, my name is Don Thompson and I’m a resident of Steilacoom. I am against the proposed rate increases to Puget Sound Energy’s (PSE’s) rates beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. While I understand that PSE may need to increase rates to keep up with inflation, the proposed increase would be more than that to increase their profit margin, which is not “fair, just and reasonable”, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,          Don Thompson          Steilacoom, WA</p>
	Jeanne Herold	E-mail	<p>Attn: UTC</p> <p>I am responding to the article in the Auburn reporter written by Steve Hunter regarding Bob Ferguson, State Attorney General's opposition to PSE's rate increase request.</p> <p>I am an 82 year old widowed woman and I am still living in my own home. I have a 63 year old disabled son that lives with me. I pay all my own utilities (no help from any discount programs) and I feel the increase that Puget Sound Energy is proposing is grossly unfair to all of Washington state residents and especially to seniors. This is just my letter to you to add to your stack of oppositions.</p> <p>I do wonder why though that all these huge companies feel they have to make so much profit. It's greed and all they care about is money. Comcast is another offender. The amount they charge is so overwhelming and in most cases TV is the only entertainment that some folks have. Comcast outsources all their telephone</p>



			<p>communication people to overseas and South America. So if a person needs to contact Comcast regarding their bill or a technical problem we're forced to speak to a foreigner. Most doctors do the same thing. America just isn't what it used to be.</p> <p>If you can help in some way it would be appreciated. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeanne Herold, citizen Auburn, Washington</p>
Jeanne Petranovich	E-mail		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I received the notice of requested changes to PSE rate and public hearings.</p> <p>I understand the need to raise the rates, but your proposal for 2023 for both electric 13.59% and natural gas 12.98% services are extremely high and will put a financial hardship on me and my family. My wages have not increased with inflation and I fear financial challenges in the future with rising costs of everything.</p> <p>Please reconsider lowering the 2023 rates to something more reasonable like 5% and leave the rates for 2024 and 2025 as proposed.</p> <p>Thank you, Ms Jean</p>
Dr. Mark D. Johnson	E-mail		<p>I am curious how much PSE pays for fossil fuel sourced electricity compared to wind and solar. A comparison with hydro power would be of interest, too. How do I find out how much PSE pays for electricity from different sources? Do you have that data? Note: it was the representative at PSE who directed me to you since she had no way to find out herself.</p> <p>Dr. Mark D. Johnson</p>
Louise Pathe	E-mail		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for</p>

			<p>many people. I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase. Thank you. Louise Pathe Kirkland, WA</p>
John P. Daly	E-mail		<p>Greetings :</p> <p>I appreciate that energy costs can be volatile for utilities. At the same time it appears it's always a 1 way ratchet for the consumer - as the rate doesn't appear to ever go down - even in a fluctuating energy price market. For many of us fixed-income state retirees (No COLA for PERS 1) that recently saw a \$500/year property tax increase, \$5/gal gas prices, 10% general inflation, and now a proposed 15% increase in our energy bills, this is not sustainable. It might work okay for a CEO with a million dollar compensation package - but not so much for us moderate income residential customers.</p> <p>If this is in fact to cover increased energy costs - perhaps a surcharge that goes BOTH up &amp; down with energy prices might be appropriate. But these double-digit rate increases are simply inappropriate &amp; inequitable to consumers.</p> <p>My family spent thousands of dollars on a highly efficient inverter heat pump to reduce our load on the grid and reduce our bills - only to see that investment in efficiency negated by PSE rate increases every single year. The PSE company will need to shoulder its part of the "shared sacrifice" in these times of erratic economics.</p> <p>Thank you, John Daly Olympia WA</p>
Lisa Ornstein	E-mail		<p>Hello, my name is Lisa Ornstein and I am a resident of Olympia. I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase. Thank you. Lisa Ornstein</p> <p>Lisa Ornstein</p>

	Dwight Rousu	E-mail	<p>The one year increases are significant.</p> <p>Changes I would like to see:</p> <p>A. Less severe increases in electricity rates; larger increases in gas rates. Since gas production and use is directly a huge source of atmospheric methane and carbon, it should be dis-incentivized during this climate emergency. This would also tend to move people to electric power, which can be sourced more from renewable sources such as solar, wind, or thermal.</p> <p>B. Past and especially any future capital expenses for gas should not be allowed as reasons to boost customer rates. It has been known for years that burning gas was rushing us toward climate disaster that could endanger the lives of our grandchildren.</p> <p>C. The proposal makes no mention of net metering for people who have solar panels. The current net metering system lets PSE zero out the account value of surplus generated power once a year. This officially sanctioned theft of funds should have a policy change. That excess value in the account should be paid to the person generating the power, not to the treasury of PSE. And if the electric rates are increased, that increase should also be reflected in annual surplus payouts.</p> <p>Dwight Rousu Redmond, WA</p>
	Isabelle Colvin	E-mail	<p>Hello!</p> <p>I'm a Residential customer and I am writing to comment on the proposed rate increases to Puget Sound Energy services, Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067, to be heard Wed. Sept. 28th.</p> <p>A rate increase is inevitable; inflation is here, and everything is rising in costs and prices. However, the proposed increase amount for 2023 that PSE wants to put into place is staggering. I had to re-reading the notice three times to make sure I saw it correctly. 13%+ percent? And average of 15% percent in 1 year?</p> <p>If you said a 1% or 2% increase over the next 5 to 10 years, I'd begrudgingly understand - no one likes bills going up, after all. but that is a "fair" amount to combat rising costs and makes sense. However, those</p>

			<p>increases in 2024 and 2025 plus a "bulk" one in 2023 of 13%/15%???</p> <p>This is going to strain already strained customers. Everything is costing more, and most of us don't see automatic raises to our paychecks. Very few people get "expected" cost of living increases, and this high of an increase to something as essential as energy, is going to hurt the people that always get hurt the most when costs go up; families and middle-class citizens. Not to mention that with the push to switch to electric cars in our state, all of us will end up paying even more on our electric bills.</p> <p>The reasoning behind this listed in the notice is nothing but buzz words. We all know everything is going to go up in price, so just say that. And if you really wanted to cut costs, how about not sending out those "efficacy reports" no one asked for and we can't opt out of? You know, the ones that tell you even those you are using under the amount they say too, that you still are using too much and keep your house at 63 in the winter?</p> <p>The bottom line is that WA is already a high cost of living state, and a 13% to 15% increase in a single year is too much. Please consider a smaller increase to the PSE rates. Thank you. ~Isabelle Corvin</p>
Mark Kane	E-mail		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment! It is very discerning to see a double digit rate increase for 2023 as proposed by PSE. Like most consumers inflation has taken it's toll. As a retired military officer, many of our young active duty folks in Kitsap County and retirees are struggling enough as it is, as well as many others living in the Greater Puget Sound Area. If rates go up commensurate with sustaining a viable public utility, that's one thing, but it must be justifiable. I've seen no explanation as to how this revenue (permanent increase) will be used for sustaining the grid. The Docket does not indicate if the rate is for just that year, or those years indicated will revert back to the current rate or becomes a permanent increase over the next 3 years which equates to about a 17% hike.</p> <p>Again what is not disclosed is the cost to improve and sustain infrastructure verses the Salary &amp; Support of PSE Executives &amp; Employees. If PSE is asking to hike rates of the consumer it would be nice to know just how much they are getting paid and if they have reasonable COLA's built in for their employees (No Golden Parachutes for the Executives).</p> <p>Now, I find it particularly odd that when we're trying to go green by pushing electric vehicles, which aren't exactly cheap for most individuals to purchase, let alone increase the price of electricity, that becomes self-defeating in the eyes of the consumer. It appears the auto makers and electric utility companies are try to capitalize on the Gov's rebate incentives (True Capitalism – Squeeze the Little Guy w/ Rate/Price Hikes).</p>

			<p>That being said, as consumers we need full disclosure and transparency as to how ANY INCREASE will benefit us.</p> <p>Again, thank you for your consideration!</p> <p>r/          Mark Kane</p>
	Alleen Penick	E-mail	<p>This request for a 15.80% 2023 and 2.41% 2024 &amp; 1.16% increase in rates is unfair to us consumers. Especially us social security people. I found that PSE already has a budget of over \$3billion and is a company for PROFIT. The 5.9% COLA for 2022 for me was \$66 dollars more a month but my space rate went up by \$60. Oh boy I had \$6. left . My space rent in a senior park is \$800 and I can't afford a 15.80% increase in my electricity. PLEASE DON'T APPROVE THIS RATE INCREASE.</p>
	Garrett Tatsumi	E-mail	<p>As a resident of Olympia, WA I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. The AGO has determined that adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not reasonable, and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.          Garrett Tatsumi          Olympia, 98501</p>
	Hugh Caton	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Hugh Caton and I am a resident of Olympia, Washington. I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Madeline Bishop	E-mail	<p>I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many</p>

			<p>people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Madeline Bishop</p>
	Karen Caton	E-mail	<p>Hello, my name is Karen Caton and I am a resident of Olympia, WA.</p> <p>I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just, and reasonable", and will definitely pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Karen Caton</p>
	Glen Hubbard	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>my name is Glen Hubbard and I am a resident of Olympia. I oppose PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. At a time when consumers are struggling with inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not "fair, just and reasonable", and will pose a hardship for many people.</p> <p>I</p> <p>urge the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Eliane Wilson	E-mail	<p>Utilities and Transportation Commissioners,</p> <p>My name is Eliane Wilson; I am a resident of Olympia, WA and a customer of PSE. I oppose the PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023 to be considered at your September 28 hearing.</p>

			<p>At a time when consumers are struggling with both inflation and higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair for PSE to charge larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill is not “fair, just and reasonable”. If it gets approved by your body, it will pose a hardship for many people in the ten counties served in western Washington.</p> <p>I urge you all to consider the welfare of Washington residents and not approve a rate increase of this magnitude.</p> <p>Thank you for taking these issues into account in your votes.</p> <p>Eliane Wilson</p>
	Daniel Roloff	E-mail	<p>To UTC,</p> <p>I have received as a PSE customer, a proposed rate increase for the next three years. As a residential forced customer, it says I would get a HUGE increase in electric rates of 15.80% in 2023! One of the great advantages of living in Washington State was some of the lowest electric rates in the United States! With this HUGE increase that would destroy that advantage! No where is there any justification for such a HUGE increase! Since this is a monopoly business, it seems only just that the customers desire a explanation! Maybe it is for all the overpaid PSE executives to get a HUGE raise! At this point I see no explanation for such a HUGE increase! It is the UTC duty to do what is best for the customers also! The customers are receiving no greater value, for such a HUGE increase!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Daniel Roloff</p>
	Virginia Haugen	E-mail	<p>In 1966 my husband and I signed a lease agreement with Washington Natural Gas Company for a gas water heater. When Puget Sound Energy bought the gas company I began paying my rental fee to PSE. A year or so ago I joined a e state Utilities and Transportation Commission hearing by telephone to give input on the sale of my lease agreement to Grand Heating. It's a company I know very little about. I and nearly all the customers who joined the UTC hearing spoke against having their contracts turned over to Grand Heating. Now PSE wants to raise our rates even though everything we pay for is taking more of our income. If I could afford solar electricity I would certainly have it. I am managing without it and I urge the State of Washington to make sure that PSE is not allowed to force another rate increase on our gas and electric bills. My thanks to Bob Ferguson for standing up for itility ratepayers in our state.</p>

	Paul Vlastelica	E-mail	<p>I am 100% against the outrageous 15.8% increase in electric rates. Do you think of retired people on fixed incomes? We are already hurting with 9% inflation and our raises do not even coming close to cover inflation.</p> <p>Vote against this huge, unrealistic increase in electric rates. Many like me only have electric available to use. Before you know it we will have rates as high as California.</p> <p>VOTE NO ON THIS ROBBERY.</p>
	Alex Golub	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>Hello, My name is Alex Golub and I am writing to you today in regards to Docket UE-220066 (electric service increase of rates by PSU) I would like to state that Generally I am Mindblown in this Proposition that I have just read and cannot believe the audacity of a Utilities company to try to raise rates for electric by almost 20% in the next three years.</p> <p>I would like to say that my electric bill in the winter is almost \$600, I have two small children and a wife at home, I and many other neighbors of mine cannot afford to pay in some cases \$200 more for just one utility per month, let alone all of the others companies I assume are also trying to raise their rates.</p> <p>This is insane to me as in these harsh trying times, I did not get anywhere near a 20% raise at work yet Ive seen inflation nearly decimate my once flourishing family, in the midst of which PSU is attempting to rob me of the last bit of money that I am able to collect for emergencies.</p> <p>Please I am not asking you, I am begging you not to let this happen. There is no real reason for this utility rate increase, they state that they want to “recover increased operating costs” well we are all getting slammed by those costs, but the consumer is the one getting the short end of the stick forced to deal with high gas prices on top of paying for the companies “increased operating costs” as well.</p> <p>In the midst of the struggles of staying afloat in a young hardworking family I cannot deal with even more expenses. Please, I implore you do not approve this request and mae it harder for normal americans just so that companies wont hurt their bottom line!</p> <p>Very respectfully, -Alex Golub</p>
	Ward Bettes	E-mail	<p>I was amazed to see the level of gas and electric rate hikes proposed by Puget Sound Energy for 2023. 13.59% for electric service and 12.98% for gas service ( I have both) is unacceptable. Please do not allow this to happen. Some increase is expected but they should spread it out over several years, not take it in one lump sum.</p> <p>Thank you Ward Bettes</p>



	Bruce Gilbert	E-mail	<p>Hello,          I feel your(PSE) request of a 13.59% increase in 2023 for electric service, leading to a 15.8% increase in residential power bills is insensitive and excessive. The proposed increase of 12.15% in natural gas service is also excessive. This would hurt lower income households particularly hard at a time when inflation is already leading to tightly stretched household budgets. I am aware that costs for generating electricity and also natural gas prices are rising but it would be helpful if your(PSE) rate increases could be at least averaged out over the 3 year period from 2023-2025 instead of front loading them in 2023.          Please be respectful of the hardships facing consumers in these difficult times and show restraint in allowing PSE the proposed rate increases.          Sincerely,          Bruce R. Gilbert          Auburn</p>
	Elaine Srnsky	Mail	***See attached PDF***
	Daniel Dalley	Mail	***See Attached PDF***
	Walter D. Ritchie	Mail	***See Attached PDF***
	Ilona S. Thompson	Mail	***See Attached PDF***
	Elizabeth A.Rogers	E-mail	<p>I am writing to request that the referenced proposed PSE electrical increase be reconsidered and reduced to a more manageable amount. I can understand that some increase may be necessary. However, a jump of almost 20% over a 3-year period would present a clear and present hardship for many low- and moderate-income PSE customers, especially since almost all other living costs are also rising.</p> <p>My spouse (age 92) and I (85) are older adults living on a moderate, largely fixed income. We reside in a manufactured housing community, primarily because it is one of very few non-subsidized affordable housing options available to us. Please do not allow our electricity bills to be increased to the point that we can no longer remain in our home. We will be gone soon enough, but we need heat and lighting in the meantime!</p> <p>PSE investors are not the only stakeholders worth consideration. We, the customers, are as well.</p> <p>Elizabeth A. Rogers</p>
	Sarah Habel	E-mail	To Whom it Mat Concern:

			<p>Dockets UE-220066 (electric service)</p> <p>The proposed rate increases are unacceptable. In the next 3 years you are proposing a total average rate increase for electric service of 19.26%!! Many people in the south sound area will simply not be able to pay. People are already struggling with the price increase of everything else. I am a PSE customer for electric service and I urge you to NOT move forward with these high-rate increases- you may end up losing customers, increase the number of delinquent accounts and FORCE some people out of their homes. Please reconsider these rate increases! Sincerely Sarah Habel Lacey, WA</p>
	Josh & Michelle Zedwick	E-mail	<p>Please do all you can to NOT increase electric rates for PSE customers! This is not the time for funding extra projects that aren't an absolute necessity for the majority of citizens. Thank you.</p>
	Norene Scott	E-mail	<p>We do not need or want this proposed project or the unnecessary and unknown Costs involved. Norene Scott</p>
	Alice Evans	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>My name is Alice Evans.</p> <p>I am a member of CENSE and for years have attended CENSE meetings and city council meetings to stay informed regarding our energy situation. I have watched PSE and its representatives steam roller over its customers, some of whom have gone to great length to advocate with facts and research for a better and much more modern and fiscally sound solution to our energy future than that proposed by PSE.</p> <p>It is clear that PSE's first consideration is the return it can produce for its mostly foreign investors. It wants its customers to produce that return by paying higher electric rates. This is profoundly unfair and simply wrong. I ask you to turn down PSE's request for a rate hike and support the best interests of our local community.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p>

			Alice B. Evans
Margaret Moore	E-mail	August 30, 2022 TO: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission RE: Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 & UG-220067 Talk about salt in the wound! As we watch Puget Sound Energy erect poles which are much more intrusive than they ever conveyed, we also find we are now being asked to pay a projected \$300 million plus beginning next year – a 20% increase in residential electric rates over a three-year period. The project is nowhere near completion, and we are already expected to pay for something from which there is yet no benefit to any ratepayer! As you review the case, please keep in mind a number of important facts regarding this contentious issue: - PSE did not allow a citizen review committee to consider any other solution to the potential power increase than the one they were proposing. Many members did not sign the final document because they felt the public process was a sham.  - There currently are a number of 21st century solutions for increasing the reliability of power delivery becoming available at a reasonable cost. Most of these would be less intrusive, more dependable and cheaper than the one PSE is implementing. PSE should have been forced to consider these before any decision was made.  - PSE is no longer a regional entity. It has been allowed to inflict an outmoded delivery system on us for potential financial gain by the foreign consortium that owns it, and we, the users, will be saddled with paying for it over many years while they reap the financial benefit.  - The project is not completed and has not even been fully vetted in two key communities. Users should not have to pay for something that doesn't exist.  - Why should rate payers begin rewarding PSE with a 9.8% rate of return on an infrastructure investment whose total cost is still unknown, whose need has not been validated and that would cost ratepayers close to \$2 billion in increased rates over the life of the project?  If the community is forced to accept the PSE Energize Eastside project, we ask that the Washington Utilities Commission, at a minimum, consider the fairness of asking ratepayers to begin paying before the project is completed and any possible benefit is realized. Do not grant any accelerated rate request before the entire project is operational. Sincerely, MargaretR Moore	

	Jenny Chan	E-mail	<p>These rate hikes are ridiculous and not keeping pace with inflation. They are all for profit for the greedy PSE. Please follow Seattle's model of much more reasonable rate hikes.</p> <p>Thanks,          Jenny Chan</p>
	Jill Payne	E-mail	<p>Please do nit allow this rate hike we can hardly afford the electric bill now and I know I'm not the only one. A lot if people especially the elderly choose between eating or Mexican and do with out to pay their electric bill. We just had a rate hike not that long ago. You want everything to be electric , car , furnace's , solar panels on roofs and if it's an older home the weight will not hold and the roof will cave in. T you want us to redo our roofs to put the solar panels on that's at least 50 to a hundred thousand dollars that people the middle class at least what's left if it to pay nit only for themselves but fir low income people. I make 100 dollars to much to get any discounts and I just make it on today cost if living. Now with inflation being so high I've cut back on any entertainment , back on grocers now they want you to pay mire fir electric. At the rate we're going we will be like California and other states with brown outs and rolling black out. There us no way out production of electricity can meet the state's standard or the government because we do not produce enough and . T even 25 years ago if the government would have stepped up and regulate fishing, logging and made industrial companies stop polluting we would nit be in the shape we're in today but money talks and they bribe our politicians and they get riches while the citizens get poorer. It's about time for ode and our government to stop spending and start saving. It tough to make ends meet now it will be even harder with thus increase. Please do not vote to pass this. If DC. does not change policies We as Americans are going to be filing bankruptcy. Do nit pass thus rate hike. Thus is probably a waste of my time because out politics are fir big corporations and themselves making money nit helping us the people but the government needs mire money and they need to follow the laws and our constitution but they don't. All illegals should nit be getting welfare or help to stay here they are illegals. You couldn't go to their country and get the same help. Do nit let this rate hike go through.</p>
	Cascade Irrigation	E-mail	<p>Public Utility Commission,</p> <p>Regarding the proposed PSE electrical increase: Cascade Irrigation District is a public non-profit entity. We estimate this increase would cost us an additional \$80,000 per year for the first year with two addition increases to follow. This increase based on our current budget would constitute %42 of our budget. Cascade Irrigation falls into the electrical schedule #35. This happens to be Primary voltage irrigation which is the schedule with the largest increase of all proposed increases for the first year. This increase will adversely effect many of our customers two and possibly three fold as many customers also have PSE for their home as well as business/farm use. Also should this increase be approved when would this information be distributed to the public as we set our budget for the upcoming year in the first week of December. Should the UTC approve this increase we would prefer to see a smaller increase for each year even if the increases were spread out over a longer period of time (smaller increases over more years). We do understand that the cost</p>

			<p>of everything is going up and that relates to the cost to produce electricity, but it also relates to everyone else in that all of our costs are going up as well. To recap: the increase to our electrical needs being at such a high percentage topped with increases from other services and goods puts an extreme hardship on the district being a non-profit entity. Your consideration of this issue is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kelton Montgomery District Manager</p>
	Carole Muth	E-mail	<p>Dear WUTC,</p> <p>I am writing in regard to Puget Power's request for a rate increase. I am a senior citizen, a sixty year resident of the area known as Somerset, and am in complete disagreement with Puget's wish to raise our rates to the degree they have stated. They ask for a rate increase of 20% for a project that is just now under construction. Even our esteemed Attorney General, who obviously knows a lot more about matter like this than I do, disagrees with their request. Just looking at it in a very measured, analytic way, it is unreasonable, and I would ask that you deny their ask.</p> <p>And on a personal basis, I have lived in my current house for nigh on sixty years now. Obviously my income is fixed, and a rate increase of this extent would present great difficulties.</p> <p>Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of Puget's request.</p> <p>Carole Muth</p>
	Susan & Stephen Bennett	E-mail	<p>Puget Sound Energy is a private company, with shareholders who want dividends. PSE is also a monopoly, which means customers have no choice in who provides our electricity, which is an essential for daily life. For those reasons, it is very important that PSE submit to monitoring, especially of service quality, compliance with state laws, and rates.</p> <p>We object vehemently to this 15% rate increase. To "decarbonize energy systems" will result in lower costs according to all the experts. To "recover more than four years of capital and operating investments" was their excuse for the last several increases . To "set rates for a multi-year rate plan" is not a reason but a statement which reflects the lack of respect PSE has for its customers.</p> <p>We request that this increase be denied.</p>

			Susan and Stephen L. Bennett
	Rick Fellows	E-mail	<p>Greetings, I am writing to oppose a PSE rate increase on electricity and gas. As a private, for profit entity PSE makes investment decisions seeking profit over public benefit, unless regulations or artificial incentives are in place. We have had to publicly force private companies to invest in conservation over energy supply.</p> <p>It seems PSE has invested in an LNG facility in Tacoma which the region and tribes strongly oppose. If this rate increase is to cover such investment, where is the incentive to engage in the kind of widely supported investment we need to be moving towards?</p>
	Nannette Kinge	E-mail	Ya my power bills have been way high mine 775 right
	Richard Escamilla	E-mail	My name is Richard Escamilla I have been retired for 16 years . PSE's 12.98% percent increase in 2023 is obscene. There was a time PSE was limited to a 4.9% increase , with staggering inflation increases like this are going to tax retirees to the limit. We are not living in luxury here. Attorney General Ferguson , there is no reason a utility company should hold Washington rate payers hostage.
	Luminita Sarbu	E-mail	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I have read about the proposed rate increase by PSE over the next 3 years which would add up to about 20%. I would like to express my concern this is way too steep of a rate increase over a short time. A lot of people are struggling to pay their bills as is. While some yearly increase would be reasonable. This would be is way too much and should not be allowed.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Luminita Sarbu        PSE customer.</p>
	Fang Cui	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are very angry about the PSE Energize Eastside Project since the project is totally UNNECESSARY. By using old technology it destroyed thousands trees, damaged many city views and views for many houses; It is also possible to hurt people in the future, especially the children, by the much stronger EMF (Electric and Magnetic Fields).</p> <p>But the project is not finished yet , PSE started to ask high electricity bill. How greedy PSE is !! From I understand that PSE will make money from the Energize Eastside Project ( I believe this since they pushed the project so hard.) Then why let us, the suffered people from the project, pay the project back ? IF the government let PSE get their wish again, ( Like Bellevue and Renton city government did for Energize Eastside Project ) I would like to ask if our government is PSE's government or people's government?</p>

			<p>And recession may start soon, does our government want to increase burden on the ordinary people in this time??!!</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>Fang and Zijian Cui Residents in Bellevue, WA</p>
Mary Clark	E-mail		<p>I received the notice of requested changes to PSE rates and Public Hearings. I am writing to express my belief that these proposed rates are unacceptably high.</p> <p>PSE is requesting in 2023 an electric rate hike of 13.59% and a natural gas hike of 12.98%.</p> <p>PSE needs to slow down its expenses just like everyone else. Reduce staff as necessary - there should have been cost reductions with the meter reading technology coming on line - it doesn't work very well but it still should have reduced staffing cost for those positions. My bills fluctuate more than ever as some months the data is read at 29 days, sometimes at 33 days, sometimes electric has a different number of days than gas - this should have led to consistent billing but it has not - given the significant increases in the last year I don't even think it is necessarily accurate. They can and should identify critical and/ or necessary staffing and capital costs and only fund those in these inflationary times.</p> <p>PSE's desire to have an increase in authorized ROE from 9.4 to 9.9 % is absurd. The existing 9.4 is excessive as it is. Utility shareholders have a steady return typically in holding utility stocks as it is. The rest of us are being whipsawed through the market with our investment funds in 2022 and probably 2023. Utility shareholders are getting enough of a steady return at this point in time and that should not be a goal of rate setting during these financial times. They can hold steady just like the rest of us are trying to do - investments are a crapshoot, returns should not be guaranteed and certainly should not be increased in today's climate.</p> <p>If these rate increases go through my utility bills will reach over \$200 per month in the winter months. This is unacceptable in a "moderate" climate area. I am not a high utilizer falling in the "good" range in PSE's analytics. While I find some of these types of programs interesting I don't think they influence users at all - therefore the cost of the educational program should be eliminated. I am fortunate enough to have been able to reduce costs to cover inflation so far but many people cannot do this - and utilities are a necessity of life, not a luxury. Most cost reductions are one time opportunities to find and eliminate a given cost, however, with all other costs rising those eliminated costs are replaced and customers still lose ground. There is nothing left to cut.</p>

			<p>If PSE is struggling to meet climate mandates from the government then they should go to the government to get funding to support the move to lower carbon footprints. The state and federal government have supported funding for some of these transition costs and PSE should be making every effort to utilize funding available from these government programs. Their stakeholders should not expect even higher returns while investment in climate preserving technology occurs - they need to absorb some cost too.</p> <p>The bottom line is now is not the time for gigantic rate increases. PSE needs to hold the line where possible and request much smaller increases (3-5%) than they are proposing for 2023. Putting more people into a position of not being able to pay utility bills is not going to help PSE meet its ROE target.</p> <p>Mary Ann Clark</p>
	Catherine Siegler	E-mail	<p>I purchased a little cabin in September 2019.</p> <p>I don't have my records here, but if memory serves me, my first few bills were below \$100. When COVID hit, I was not able to visit, therefore did not use power (except to keep heat low so as not to freeze pipes). My bills were erratic and out-of-this-world high, up as high as \$155 and as low as \$13. I phoned a couple of times, even suggesting that perhaps the transformer or my meter was faulty? Each of the two times I called, my next month's bill was below \$30.</p> <p>To understand this better, I tried creating spreadsheets, but it was beyond me because billing was not monthly. I'm a single senior with few visitors, and at my place only on weekends. I don't use the oven nor dishwasher. My largest appliance is a 2017 fridge, I replaced an old microwave and other other small appliances with energy-efficient ones. My electric consumption needs are very modest. The neighbours I canvassed have confirmed my bills are higher than theirs.</p> <p>What does this all have to do with rate increases? Well, for one, you have to submit proper billing on a consistent timeline. Also, your customers need the assurance that equipment is functioning reliably and maintained on a regular basis. How do your customers know the bills are accurate if they're not on a monthly rate? How do they know their meters are functioning properly? What about the transformers?</p> <p>In closing, I feel at a huge disadvantage, helpless to effect positive changes, and reliant on whatever you mete out. I respectfully request you seriously temper your proposed rate increases with systems that are functioning properly and fairly.</p> <p>Catherine Siegler</p>



	Kenra Brewer	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Kenra Brewer</p>
	Jack Hogan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad</p>

			<p>for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jack Hogan</p>
Michael Madden	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. <p>Michael Madden</p>	
Amy Van	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Amy Van</p>
	Cheryl Waitkevich	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This</p>

			<p>assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>cheryl waitkevich</p>
Lloyd Johnston	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lloyd Johnston</p>
Gregory Denton	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. And the International Energy Agency states that there can be no new investments in fossil fuels. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Gregory Denton</p>
	Amy Harris	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Amy Harris
Cynthia Ervin	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Cynthia Ervin Seattle, Washington 98115	
Mary Jane Calderon	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.	

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mary Jane Calderon</p>
	Susan Zubalik	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak saving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>Susan Zubalik</p>
	D. Robinson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>d robinson</p>
	John Chan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This</p>



			<p>assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>John Chan</p>
Theresa Skager	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. <p>Theresa Skager</p>	
Shawwna Stafford	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized	

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Shawna Stafford</p>
Leo Kucewicz	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Leo Kucewicz</p>

Aimee Hamilton	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Aimee Hamilton</p>	
Amy Faith	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Members:</p> <p>I am writing to oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed twenty percent rate increase over three years, starting in 2023. Rate payers should not reward PSE for Energize Eastside; a project not fully permitted yet, not proven to be necessary, nor completed yet. PSE would charge us over 300 million dollars for this project, and gain a 9.8 % rate of return ; earning more than 2 billion over the life of the project. Clearly, the only ones benefiting from this would be Puget Sound Energy. Please do not allow this increase.</p> <p>Sincerely, Amy Faith</p>	

	Lorie Lucky	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Lorie Lucky</p>
	Erik Hammerstrom	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Erik Hammerstrom</p>
	Lisa Jutte	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lisa Jutte</p>
	Kristin Kirby	E-mail	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I find it completely unacceptable that PSE would raise the rates 15.8% on average for residential customers.</p>

			<p>Why should PSE get an additional \$310.6 million in revenue? How does this positively effect the community? It's a completely unwarranted and unrealistic increase for residents.</p> <p>Thank you, Kristin Kirby</p>
Barbara Menne	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Barbara Menne	
Miranda Johnson	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice	

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Miranda Johnson</p>
	Peggy Printz	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The facility is fully constructed only because PSE began construction without obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels - when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers.</p> <p>Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>PSE falsely claims that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. Tacoma should do this instead of encouraging more gas usage.</p> <p>The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Peggy Printz</p>
	Sarwesh Kumar	E-mail	<p>Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>I read with interest the proposed rate increases by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The rate increases for 2023 - 13.59% for electric and 12.98% for natural gas is preposterous. The reasons given by PSE:</p>

			<p>Continue to provide safe and reliable energy service - What is going to change that will require additional resources and funding?</p> <p>Capital and operating investments made on behalf of customers - Why were these done? Were these approved by customers? Were the customers told that by doing these investments, they will see a significant rate hike?</p> <p>Recover increased operating cost - Does these costs relate to substantial increase in pay for employees and management?</p> <p>Increase return on equity - Is current 9.4% return not enough? I will say that is a very high yield and very much comparable to market.</p> <p>The rate increases for 2024 and 2025 seems reasonable.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sarwesh Kumar</p>
	Christina Marchione	E-mail	<p>I would like to submit a comment. I am currently on budget plan with PSE. I already know I will pay more this month because of using the air conditioner more. The proposed rate increase is full of a lot of unknowns. Summers are getting hotter. Other bills are going up around us, like food and gas. If PSE is truly honoring it's commitment for green energy, shouldn't rates be going down? Also, Recovering expenses as a reason to increase should have a little more accountability than just a notice of rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Christina Marchione (resident)</p>
	Melissa Roberts	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p>



			<p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Melissa Roberts</p>
Aliza Yair	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.	

			Aliza Yair
	Tim Leadingham	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir/Madam:</p> <p>I am a customer of PSE and I own a community solar share. PSE should be required to treat owners of a share of a solar project like an owner of solar generation anywhere else, with getting net-metering credit. We only get credit at the rate of half the retail rate for our production share. It would be reasonable to make a deduction for transmission costs, but PSE does not show us the justification for only crediting our share at half the retail rate. We sometimes use less than our share of production and we pay the full retail rate for what we use. PSE sells the excess of our share at the retail rate, so why don't we get full credit for that?</p> <p>PSE is selling its share in Colstrip 2 back to Talen. They should be required to invest all of that back into renewable energy for customers. PSE should also be required to present a plan to its customers for carbon-free electricity production by 2035. Thank you,</p>
	James Stanton	Phone	<p>External Email</p> <p>In addition to the information included in Attorney General Ferguson's opposition to the rate increase, the rate increase would also help fund an unlicensed LNG facility which is opposed by the Puyallup peoples. The combination of unjustified cost claims and suspect uses are sufficient reasons to reject this rate increase.</p> <p>James Stanton          Mercer Island, WA</p>
	Riley Lynch	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Riley Lynch</p>
	<p>Mark Davidson</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>For-profit PSE spent unlimited and irresponsible amounts of money on professional lobbyists, a national campaign manager, national “experts” willing to prostitute themselves for enormous sums of money, lawyers who charge exorbitant rates and in house employees used for PR functions in order to get its Energize Eastside project approved over virtually unanimous neighborhood opposition and the well considered opinions of neutral experts.</p> <p>Now PSE seeks to pass these costs on to its customers by imposing very significant rate increases. Has PSE even been required to disclose how much it spent on its campaign for approval of Energize Eastside? And cross-examined to determine the truth of its disclosure? That information is essential to a fair appraisal of its rate increase request.</p> <p>On a larger scale, isn’t it enough that PSE’s profits will increase substantially as a result of the project approval when it sells the excess power its project will generate to third parties including Canadian companies? Its current request, if granted, means that residential customers like my wife and I, retired and on fixed incomes, will end up paying for the “spare no cost” campaign for Energize Eastside regulatory approval. Regrettably, PSE prevailed. That’s enough. It should not also be able to burden the losing parties with its battle costs. It started this war and it should not be allowed to saddle consumers like us with its cost of doing business. Especially a battle whose result will only increase its profits.</p> <p>PSE’s request for a rate increase should be denied.</p> <p>Mark Davidson</p>
	<p>Brett Anton</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        As opposed by the Washington AG office, a rate increase should be avoided by PSE. While the company wishes to paint hikes as part of it’s public duty to create clean energy, such hikes are not reasonable given the</p>

			<p>cost of what PSE wants to do.</p> <p>Rate increases are primarily a boon to higher profits (the company wants to see 10% profit in upcoming years), a burden the public shouldn't bear.</p> <p>Additionally, PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked "natural" gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE's decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the "lowest cost". When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Brett Anton</p>
	Thomas Doe	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am a PSE customer who is dismayed to hear the company is seeking your approval to raise its electricity rates by 6.9% and gas rates by 7.9%. The cost of PSE's dirty energy is already among the highest in the state. Please reject this request!</p> <p>Now is not the time to reward PSE's Canadian and Dutch investors with an extra \$200 million per year while the company continues to pursue infrastructure projects like Energize Eastside, the Lake Hills Transmission Line, and the Tacoma LNG plant. These projects raise safety risks for residents, destroy thousands of valuable urban trees, and do little to provide cleaner energy. PSE refuses to provide data demonstrating the</p>

			<p>need and safety of the projects and rejects offers to meet with community leaders to discuss better options for our energy future.</p> <p>Until PSE demonstrates its commitment to improve reliability, reduce environmental impacts, and truly listen to community concerns, we respectfully ask the Commission to deny all PSE rate increases.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Thomas Doe</p>
	Max Savishinsky	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Max Savishinsky</p>
	Emily Puterbaugh	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy should not be taking advantage of people who rely on utilities to live.</p>

			<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Emily Puterbaugh</p>
	Emily Moore	E-mail	<p>***See attachment for comment***</p> <p>Dear Executive Director Maxwell,</p> <p>Please find attached Sightline’s comments on the docket UG-220067.</p> <p>Thank you,        Emily Moore</p>
	Kim & Steve McCool	E-mail	<p>***See attachment for comment***</p>
	Jenna Judge	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead,</p>

			<p>they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Jenna Judge</p>
	Sydnee Chinn	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sydney Chinn</p>
	Karen Lester	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Karin Lester</p>
	Natalie Mendez	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>



			<p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Natalie Mendez</p>
	Sarah Titus	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more</p>

			<p>methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Sarah Titus</p>
	<p>Quinn Scollard</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Quinn Scollard</p>
	<p>Kristiana Lapo</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        I am a PSE and I can't afford this rate increase. Even if I could, I'm barely making ends meet and I have no</p>

desire to increase your profit margin, especially one determined by the Attorney General to be bloated, with what little money I have for a basic human necessity of keeping my lights on and heating my home. Additionally, LNG is not a climate solution. LNG had long been used as a distraction from real climate solutions while still contributing to the problem. Even if LNG were a solution, the proposed facility I'm Tacoma is not going to heat my home - it's for cargo ships. Why am I paying for that? PSE should pay for their own pet project.

This rate increase is bad for customers, for whom heating and electricity is a basic right and necessity, it's bad for the environment despite claims otherwise.

I sign on with Tacoma350 on the following statement:

I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.

Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.

PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.

Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.

Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.

Best,  
Kristiana Lapo  
PSE Customer by monopoly and basic human necessity, not choice  
Kristiana Lapo

commanderbi ffle	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Dale Walter	E-mail	<p>For people on fixed incomes, inflation has raised havoc. Again, PSE is requesting another rate increase that totally contributes to our already staggering inflation. I hope the UTC sees fit to reject the increase request. We can only handle so much!! Dale Walter</p>
Mark Vossler	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs. Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities. PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation</p>

			<p>for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Mark Vossler</p>
	Jesse Bohlin	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am writing to support the opinion that Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>As a resident of the Puget Sound, I have been proud to see our region to push forward progressive, climate smart solutions that prioritize the health and safety of our communities. This proposed rate increase is to provide funds to PSE to prioritize investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. This is not the type of renewable energy projects that members of our community have advocated for, and therefore should not be made to pay for these through rate increases.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>I encourage you to deny this proposal by PSE and center the needs of the community.</p> <p>Jesse Bohlin Jesse Bohlin</p>

	Dave McIver	E-mail	<p>The proposed 2023 rate increases for PSE for electric and natural gas service should not be allowed. We are on a fixed budget as senior citizens and this will adversely effect us and other senior citizens. Furthermore, this large increase should not be allowed during a time of a recession. It will adversely affect most low to middle income class households. Also, this 2023 increase is larger than the current rate of inflation which equates to the cost of living for everyone. The reasons stated by PSE as to their justification for this large 2023 increase, as well as a multiyear rate plan, should be thoroughly questioned and changed based upon the realities stated above and other similar comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, David and Carol McIver</p>
	Ashley Zimmerman	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Ashley Zimmerman amcnab113@gmail.com</p>

			Tacoma, Washington 98405
	Cindy Kisska	E-mail	<p>I emailed a short comment and sent it to comments@utc.wa.gov on Thurs. Sept. 22, 2022 12:42 PM. Please replace it with this one I am sending in now, as this one is much longer and has many more detailed important facts. Thank you.</p> <p>My name is Cindy Kisska. I have been a Puget Sound Energy electric customer for 18 years. Every year PSE raises our rates. Every year the UTC holds a phone conference for one hour when we can call in. And every year the UTC ignores the public outcry to NOT give PSE permission to raise our rates AGAIN. Every year our complaints fall on deaf ears. We have one hour a year to speak our peace, and what happens? Nothing. It is business as usual. EVERY SINGLE YEAR PSE is allowed to RAISE OUR RATES.</p> <p>The UTC treats PSE as if it is two separate companies – one that services its shareholders, and one that services its customers. The company is ONE company, NOT two.</p> <p>Lets examine the facts: Truth is facts. What are the PSE’s facts? Simply put, PSE takes in Billions of dollars every year and gives away Millions of dollars in profits to its shareholders and CEOs every year, while STILL being allowed to raise our electric rates every single year.</p> <p>The profits PSE makes, should be funneled down to its customers FIRST to lower our electric rates, NOT funneled upward FIRST TO PAY their ALREADY wealthy shareholders. The UTC’s first and most important priority and concern is to protect the customers FIRST, because we are the one’s struggling to pay our ever rising PSE bills, while still being able to afford to put food on our tables. These are OUR FACTS.</p> <p>There are several programs, such as “LIHEAP” and the “H.E.L.P.” program in place to financially help low-income customers pay their electric PSE bills. BUT Puget Sound Energy, the Utilities and Transportation Commission, and the Attorney General’s Office, should NOT rest easy thinking that they have the poor people’s backs covered, when so many PSE customers don’t qualify for these programs BECAUSE THEIR INCOME IS JUST A FEW DOLLARS ABOVE THE CUT-OFF TO QUALIFY. KNOW FOR A FACT, there are 1000’s and 1000’s of families in the state of Washington, including children and the elderly, who are still suffering day and night in their cold houses and apartments because they cannot afford to turn their thermostats up any more than they already are. Tell this to PSE’s already wealthy CEOs and Shareholders.</p> <p>THE QUESTION REMAINS: WHY is PSE given the OKAY EVERY YEAR by the UTC TO GET AWAY WITH RAISING OUR RATES under the following BLARRING FACTS: 1) PSE paid almost \$40 million dollars to their top 5 Executive Employees over a 3 year period (2016, 2017, 2018) in salaries, incentives, compensations and bonuses. That was 4 years ago. It is now 2022. You can be</p>

sure the amount has gone up.  
2) PSE took in \$3.4 Billion Dollars in 2019 and paid out \$64.2 million to their shareholders to pay for 5 foreign country's pension funds.  
3) PSE belongs to a group called "Investor-Owned Utilities" ("IOUs") that service electric and gas customers across the state of WA. "They are all monopoly franchises" and "THEY EXIST to make a PROFIT FOR THEIR SHAREHOLDERS." PSE is a utility company, NOT a Fortune 500 Company.  
4) These Investor-Owned Utilities, including PSE, paid out a total of ALMOST \$400 MILLION DOLLARS - \$395.3 Million Dollars to be exact - in DIVIDENDS in 2019.  
5) PSE has become a "Profit-Churning Machine." They have become top heavy, with way too much money floating around at the top. WHY HAVE PSE'S PROFITS NEVER "trickled down" TO TRANSLATE INTO SAVINGS FOR PSE'S Electric Customers to LOWER OUR RATES?  
6) PSE takes in over \$100 MILLION DOLLARS EVERY MONTH from just their electric customers alone.  
7) PSE SHOULD NEVER BE ALLOWED TO INCLUDE as one of their REASONS to raise our rates because customers are using less electricity. People ARE USING LESS AND LESS ELECTRICITY BECAUSE THEY CAN'T AFFORD PSE'S HIGHER AND HIGHER RATES!

**PSE DOESN'T FOLLOW UTC'S ORDERS:**

- In 2013, the UTC ordered PSE to share its profits 50/50 with customers. I know of at least 2 more times, that the UTC also ordered PSE to share their profits with us. But somehow, PSE has found ways to get around this. They have NEVER shared their profits with us to lower our rates. How is it that PSE seems to have become more powerful than the UTC itself? PSE blatantly ignores and gets away with it, over and over again, UTC's direct orders to share their profits with their customers.

- When the UTC ordered PSE to share its profits 50/50 with customers, the Commission used what's called "earning tests" that required PSE to share excess profits with customers "in certain circumstances". This took place as part of a multi-year rate plan, and PSE's earnings would have had to go above an authorized amount before credits to customers were required. (The rate plan expired in 2017.)

- So....according to the "earning tests" PSE didn't make enough profits to share with their customers. AND I WANT TO SAY...."BUT NOT BEFORE PROFITS WERE TURNED OVER BY PSE TO ITS SHAREHOLDERS."

- PSE'S has a "Code of Conduct" that states that all their Corporate Officers, Treasurer, etc. "are empowered to ensure THAT ALL STAKEHOLDER'S INTERESTS (meaning Shareholder's interests, meaning profits) are appropriately balanced, protected and preserved."

- If PSE has re-constructed itself in such a way that profits to its shareholders come first, instead of savings to its customers....then this deranged arrangement needs to be taken up by the Attorney General's Office.



- The UTC and the OAG stand by and watch PSE's safety nets and structures that used to be in place to protect the customers, all being burned to the ground! If there are loop-holes in the way PSE has re-structured its utility company financially, then these loop-holes need to be closed. Where is the Attorney General, Bob Ferguson in all of this? It's not enough for him to just say he doesn't approve of PSE raisings its rates....it's another to actually do something about it. I'm surprised he hasn't already stepped up to stop PSE in their tracks and MAKE THEM TOW THE LINE by ensuring that UTC's orders are followed, and that PSE shares their profits with their customers FIRST, to ensure they lower our rates. Let PSE use their millions of dollars in profits to LOWER our rates. PSE SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO USE A MYRP (Multi-Year Rate Plan). Instead they should be held to account EVERY SINGLE YEAR.

When I talk about an "Ethical Assessment" of PSE, THIS IS KEY: Why is PSE ALLOWED by UTC and Bob Ferguson in the OAG, to give away millions of dollars to the already very wealthy shareholders, while people in Washington State are shivering in their houses trying to keep warm because they can't afford to pay a higher electric bill? What sense does it make? NONE!

WHO IS PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PSE CUSTOMERS and ENSURING OUR INTERESTS/ NEEDS are "appropriately balanced, protected and preserved"?

THE WORD "INTERESTS" HAS A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT MEANING WHEN IT IS APPLIED TO SHAREHOLDERS, AS COMPARED TO WHEN IT IS APPLIED TO CUSTOMERS:

1) The answer PSE customers are given as to why PSE is allowed to raise our electric rates each and every year, is from the Office of the Attorney General:

"In the end, the Commissioners must ensure that rates are fair, just and reasonable for all interests involved."

2) PSE's Shareholder's interests are vastly different from PSE's Customer's interests. I feel these two "interests" should not be used in the same sentence, because their meaning is completely opposite one another.

3) Customer "interest" is actually the Customer's NEED....the need to stay warm in the winter and the need to still be able to afford to pay their ever rising PSE electric bill.

4) The Shareholder's interest means how much money (profits) they are able to make. In other words, the already wealthy becoming wealthier.

5) Under this context, raising PSE customer's electric rates every year IS NEITHER FAIR, JUST, NOR REASONABLE: The wealthy don't need protection, but the poor and vulnerable do.

6) Being able to stay warm in our houses in the winter should be a Human Right. UTC – Do your job and DO WHAT IS RIGHT. PSE's moral obligations and financial obligations should be one and the same. Right now, there is a huge cavern between them.

			<p>7) The UTC needs to hold PSE's feet to the fire! They are dishonest, lie, cheat, and are constantly manipulating and misrepresenting their financial facts to try and get more money. SHOCKING that this is our Utility company and WHO YOU have to deal with! It's impossible to find the honest truth when dealing with PSE. And we, the customers bear the cruelty of their dishonesty.</p> <p>One last thought: MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF PSE PROFITS ARE BEING FUNNELED OUT OF WASHINGTON STATE AND THE U.S. EVERY YEAR. \$64.2 MILLION DOLLARS IN 2019 went to five Foreign Countries' Pension Funds. That's a HECK OF A LOT OF MONEY that could be well spent in our Local Communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The first priority should be for PSE to LOWER the costs of our energy bills.</li><li>b. Then, how about investing in SUSTAINABLE, RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES....like SOLAR POWER.</li><li>c. How about projects that help clean up our environment....protect our ecological natural resources....such as the vital salmon runs necessary for our food chain.</li><li>d. How about helping to fund our schools. The fact is most of our schools are severely lacking enough Student Counselors....the Blaine Middle School has ONLY ONE COUNSELOR FOR OVER 400 STUDENTS, and the High School HAS TWO COUNSELORS FOR ABOUT 650 STUDENTS.....The NEED for more counselors is ENORMOUS – the highest number (about 65% to 70%) of calls to the National Suicide Help Line are students between 11 and 15 years old wanting to end their lives because they are so stressed out by school itself (the heavy over-load of academi</li></ul>
	Ilsa Oldoski	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>lisa Oldoski loldoski@yahoo.com Tacoma, Washington 98404-3912</p>
	Jeremy Harrison-Smith	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked "natural" gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE's decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the "lowest cost". When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Jeremy Harrison-Smith</p>

	Dana Harris	E-mail	<p>UTC &amp; Public Counsel,</p> <p>I feel this rate increase is quite steep. I cannot pinpoint if this is price gouging, but I know they raised their rates the other year as they always add on increases for the new year and the years after. I feel the steep increase for the 2023 year is based on a concept of what one might call the used car salesman and asking for an incredibly exorbitant price because the last price didn't work so they ask for a more significant raise to get some percent.</p> <p>Not all of this work at Microsoft or Google or Facebook, a lot of us just have regular jobs and are living paycheck to paycheck due to the increase in the cost of living, and now you want to increase electricity by almost 16% over what you already got granted in your previous increase? This is outrageous you're shareholders aren't starving as most of us are and can't make ends meet and now one needs to make a choice between using heat/electricity or groceries?</p> <p>You are the only company we can go with where we live, we don't get a choice of different companies, this is a full- monopoly! This is really ridiculous increase one does not even get that increase a year with employment for the cost of living~except for your shareholders or stakeholders. This is unacceptable and there's no other competition to keep the price down this is a monopoly, this is price gouging, and this is unfair! I also feel that the amount you say will generate is under, as you're not projecting the cost associated with the new transportation of the light rail and the electricity used for lighting in the East Side new trail.</p> <p>Each year you try to raise by an exuberate amount also attaching an increase for the next couple of years after, so what is the increase you have already been granted for 2022, 2023, and 24? I feel you think some of us forgot that.</p> <p>If people in Seattle are concerned about the Seattle City Light electric increase of around 5%, how is it your increase of almost 16% even compare?</p> <p>The price of gas and groceries are hurting a lot of us and you ask for a 16% increase on top of what you already got granted last year for this year. PSE, you really stink.</p> <p>Thank you, Dana Harris</p>
	Patti Rader	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Patti Rader</p>
Jim Bernthal	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

		<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jim Bernthal</p>
	Lorraine Johnson	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth



		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lorraine Johnson</p>
Laureen France		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laureen France</p>
	Jolie Misek	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jolie Misek</p>
James Hipp	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, james hipp</p>
	Sara Bhakti	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Re: PSE request LNG project Tacoma</p> <p>Protecting the environment is my top priority. Please show us it is a priority of yours, too. I can't say it any better than this, from WEC, an environmental group that I support:</p> <p>The proposed LNG facility in Tacoma by PSE is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sara Bhakti</p>
Brian Odell	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Brian Odell</p>
	Donald Kunze	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>



cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Donald Kunze
Lori Stefano	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lori Stefano</p>
	Klaudia Englund	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Klaudia Englund

	Pawiter Parhar	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Pawiter Parhar</p>
	Michael Saunders	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michael Saunders</p>
	NJ Tuttle	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nj Tuttle</p>
Melissa Roberts	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Melissa Roberts</p>
	Roger Clark	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Roger Clark</p>
Mary Garttmeier	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mary Gartmeier</p>
	Patricia Burnsides	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Patricia Burnside</p>
Kristin Firzpatrick	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kristin Fitzpatrick</p>
	Rich Lague	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>



will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Rich Lague
	Tonya Stiffler	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tonya Stiffler</p>
John Samaras	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        John Samaras</p>
	Robert Astyk	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Astyk</p>
	Barak Gale	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Second Day Rosh Hashanah</p> <p>Today, the Jewish New Year, we celebrate the birth of the world, acknowledge the privilege to live on this sacred Earth, and we also take an accounting our souls, of our deeds. I can't think of a better way to honor this day than to express my hope and desire that the Commissioners will deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG Project, a project that is more than mere folly, rather an egregious program harmful to the planet and to our population. I witnessed such folly living in S.F. In 1989 at the time of the Loma Prieta Earthquake, and I remember well the horror of the fire in the Marina District. Landfills, earthquake territory, gas pipelines- it was a scarily similar mix as we see now in Tacoma. There are much better ways, renewable paths. Let's waste no time and embrace the life sustaining paths.</p> <p>Thank you. Barak Gale PSE Customer Tumwater, WA *****</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barak Gale</p>
	SUe Lepore	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>



			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sue Lepore</p>
	Dan Streiffert	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>Solar, wind and batteries are now the fastest and least expensive source of electricity, and they continue to cheaper every day. There is no reason to pay for LNG.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dan Streiffert</p>
Joanne Kelly	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, JOANNE KELLY</p>
	Steve Uyenishi	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Steve Uyenishi</p>
Keith Cowan	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Keith Cowan</p>
	Noel Barnes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,



			Noel Barnes
Stephen Bangs	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephen Bangs</p>
	Barbara Gregory	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Barbara Gregory</p>
	Cheryl Biale	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Cheryl Biale</p>
	John Macdonald	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, John Macdonald</p>
	Toniann Reading	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Toniann Reading</p>
	Ellen Gray	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>



			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Ellen Gray</p>
	Sarah Bauman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sarah Bauman</p>
Audrey Zemke	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Audrey Zemke</p>
Melissa Ropke	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Melissa Ropke
Barbara Scavezze	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara Scavezze</p>
	Karen Taylor	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Karen Taylor



	Susan Thiel	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Susan Thiel</p>
	Alec Mcdougall	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Alec McDougall</p>
	Carole Henry	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carole Henry</p>
	Yvonne Leach	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Yvonne Leach</p>
	Dan Senour	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dan Senour</p>
Eric Mandel	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Eric Mandel</p>
	Thomas Libbey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Thomas Libbey</p>
Carol Stevens	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carol Stevens</p>
	Kristi Hendrickson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Kristi Hendrickson
	Janet Way	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Janet Way</p>
	Danielle Zufelt	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Danielle Zufelt</p>
	Jeri Harris	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,



Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, jeri harris</p>
	Phil Ritter	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Phil Ritter</p>
	<p>Phillis Hatfield</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Phyllis Hatfield</p>
John Thompson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, John Thompson</p>
	Brett Bowman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Brett Bowman</p>
Lillian Barrett	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>



			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lillian Barrett</p>
	DOmingo Hermosillo	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Domingo Hermosillo
Kristen Randall	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kirsten Randall</p>
	Suzanne Natrass	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Suzanne Natrass

	Theresa Constance	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Theresa Constance</p>
James Bate	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, James Bates</p>
	Gayle Riggins	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>



impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gayle Riggins</p>
	Stuart Mork	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stuart Mork</p>
	Barabara DuBois	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara DuBois</p>
Laurence Leveen	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laurence Leveen</p>
	Abraham Frank	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Abraham Frank</p>
Tim Rettmann	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>



			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tim Rettmann</p>
	Ilya Bucshteyn	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Ilya Bukshteyn
	Gloria Skouge	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gloria Skouge</p>
	S.F. Brown	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, S.F. Brown</p>
	Gill Fahrenwald	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gill Fahrenwald</p>
	Jane Leavitt	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Jane Leavitt</p>
	Ruth Hooper	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>



this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Ruth Hooper</p>
	Hilarie Ericson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Hilarie Ericson</p>
	Jennifer Morsello	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jennifer Morsello</p>
Lloyd Johnston	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lloyd Johnston</p>
	alisha leviten	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, alisha leviten
Veronica Ruffin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	



			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Veronica Ruffin</p>
	Nancy Rasmussen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Nancy Rasmussen

	Danielle Rowland	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	------------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Danielle Rowland</p>
	Felicity Devlin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Felicity Devlin</p>
	Nancy Vandenberg	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Vandenberg</p>
	John Lee	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>I am a PSE customer / ratepayer. I understand from the information PSE has presented that very little of the fuel produced at this facility will be used by ordinary ratepayers like me, while PSE is asking us to pay almost half of the facility's costs.</p> <p>I think it is deeply unfair to ask ordinary people to subsidize PSE's search for a new profit center.</p> <p>Thank you, John Lee</p>
	Dennis Mace	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			Thank you, Dennis Mace
Jill Tiffany	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jill Tiffany</p>
	Dave Baine	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Dave Baine

	C DeMaris	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, C DeMaris</p>
Arnold Strang	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	<p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Arnold Strang</p>
	CHARLES POMEROY	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, CHARLES POMEROY</p>
Stephanie Peace	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	<p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephanie Peace</p>
	Darlene Baker	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Darlene Baker</p>
David Hand	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Hand</p>
	Leslie Holle	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Leslie Holle</p>
R. Larson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, R. Larson</p>
	Patrick McKee	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Are you kidding? PSE jumps ahead of the permitting process and over-rules the express will of the Puyallup people to put an environmentally catastrophic LNG facility (intended for commercial sale of fracked gas, not for powering Washington homes) on unceded tide flat land in Tacoma, and now insists on increasing our rates to pay off their shareholders?</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). But the record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to



			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Patrick McKee</p>
Ruth King	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Ruth King</p>
	Bob Jacobs	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Bob Jacobs
	Robert Blumenthal	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Blumenthal</p>
	Paul Bakke	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Paul Bakke</p>
	Betty Terrell	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Betty Terrell</p>
	Karen Ahern	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Karen Ahern</p>
	Matt Hohensee	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Matt Hohensee</p>
Sara Grendon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sara Grendon</p>
Joel Flank	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Joel Flank</p>
Phyllis Farrell	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Phyllis Farrell</p>
	Darcy Johnson	E-mail	<p>ear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			<p>Thank you, Darcy Johnson</p>
	Joshua Friedmann	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Please do not require ratepayers to pay for PSE's expensive and poorly conceived marine vessel-serving project.</p> <p>PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed. Demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</p> <p>PSE has represented that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. It is inequitable for them to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would also have the poor policy outcome of encouraging the company to promote continued growth in use fracked gas by marine vessels and transportation (and of course, increased sales for PSE).</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to our utilities.</p> <p>Thank you, Joshua Friedmann</p>
	Ben Moore	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Ben Moore
	peter hapke	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma. This project does not reflect the values of Washingtonians and will harm the planet with its carbon emissions. If the Commission does not kill this project, then state ratepayers should not pay for it.</p> <p>Thank you, peter hapke</p>
	Lynn Rabenstein	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Lynn Rabenstein
Jane Frazer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jane Frazer</p>
	Norm Conrad	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash highly polluting projects. To this end, I urge you to deny any form of approval to the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Norm Conrad



	elyette weinstein	E-mail	<p>ear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-------------------	--------	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, elyette weinstein</p>
	Elizabeth Klein	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>The neighborhood has fought this for years and does not want to pay for it!!</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Elizabeth Klein</p>
	Mana Iluna	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mana Iluna</p>
Erik LaRue	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Erik LaRue</p>
	Carlo Voli	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carlo Voli</p>
Ileen OLeary	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>



			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Ileen O'Leary</p>
	Lona Sepessy	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lona Sepessy</p>
Amber Khan	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Amber Khan</p>
Betty Barats	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Betty Barats
Margretta Voinot-Baron	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Margretta Voinot-Baron</p>
	Sally Bartow	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is NOT needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and UNACCEPTABLE impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has UNACCEPTABLE environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to DENY prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Sally Bartow



	Heather Kreeck	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Heather Kreeck</p>
	Dan Schneider	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dan Schneider</p>
	Joseph Lopez	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Joseph Lopez</p>
	Janet Wynne	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Janet Wynne</p>
	Sidonie Wittman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sidonie Wittman</p>
Eldon Leuning	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Eldon Leuning</p>
	Sandy Covich	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sandy Covich</p>
	bob barnes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, bob barnes</p>
	Thom Lufkin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Thom Lufkin
	Allen Stiles	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Allen Stiles</p>
	Corrie Yackulic	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). We strongly object to PSE's proposed rate hike to pay for the LNG facility that no one wanted and that is extremely problematic--for the community, for the environment. I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Corrie Yackulic</p>
	R Gallagher	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>



greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
	Lee Huntington- Bradley	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I very much urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Gary Brill	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Gary Brill
	Sammy Low	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
	June Quemado	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
June Quemado

	Tina Ethridge	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	--------	---



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tina Ethridge</p>
	Emma Wyler	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , PSE customers shouldn't have to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are appealing the permits in court. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years before obtaining proper permits! The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities: the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. The UTC must immediately stop reimbursing PSE for infrastructure dealing in fracked gas. Emma Wyler</p>
	Adina Parsley	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Adina Parsley</p>
	COLLEEN GRAY	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Fracked gas—stored dangerously close to where humans live and work—is being stored in a facility built before being permitted. On the last document I read, PSE claimed its natural gas customers will get 1-2 days worth of gas per year for up to ten years, if needed. This facility was never built to supply natural gas to its customers. It should not be allowed to operate and its costs should not be born by us.</p> <p>Thank you,        COLLEEN GRAY</p>
	Carolyn Treadway	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). IF species currently on Earth are to survive, all fossil fuels <b>MUST</b> remain IN THE GROUND. FOREVER. The LNG facility is an unmitigated disaster. It should be torn down immediately, and no other such facility built anywhere.</p>

The record is clear that this Tacoma facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carolyn Treadway</p>
	Mary Stone	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mary Stone</p>
	M. Judith Ferguson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Commission members - It's disturbing to know that Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is once again requesting additional \$\$ from residential customers to subsidize costs for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery and their fossil fuel investments, including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>Flaunting construction and permitting requirements, PSE began construction of the LNG refinery over two years before obtaining the proper permits. Those permits are still under appeal in court by the Puyallup Tribe</p>

			<p>and Earthjustice. PSE also completely altered the original purpose of the LNG facility, which was two fold: fueling for TOTE vessels and 'peak shaving.' It was stated many times in the early years that bunkering or export was not in their plans. Testimony last year during the Pollution Control Board appeal stated the now well known fact that LNG will be bunkered, barged and put on both ocean going vessels and interstate tractor-trailer rigs. PSE also stated, and continues to state, that the affects of an explosion at the LNG plant could be contained within a cyclone fence surrounding the facility. The Beirut, Lebanon explosion 'blew up' that ridiculous statement. Puget Sound Energy has also changed ownership a number of times. They have little to lose, but much to gain by continued consumer rate increase requests. State of Washington rate users have much to lose to a company that will simply sell itself to the next highest bidder when times get tough as the use of LNG continues to be questioned. During testimony at the Pollution Control Board hearing, PSE stated that they currently had no demand for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG). They had no customers other than TOTE, their original client, whose ship retrofit had yet to be completed. Nor did PSE anticipate needing LNG for peak shaving, because it is only forecast to be needed during periods of high demand during the coldest winter months.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>PSE has a long history of false assertions, the most recent one being that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. PSE has also created headlines over the past several years regarding suits against them for being the cause of fires and/or explosions due to lack of line maintenance and management, as well as violations of gas-safety rules.</p> <p>As you are aware, the Port of Tacoma owns the LNG facility and leases it to PSE. In the event of a loss, Tacoma residents will be the ones holding the bag for a potentially lethal operation that is not adequately insured. There is no sound reason to grant a rate increase to PSE to subsidize an industry that is in decline. After a solid growth in 2021, China's gas and LNG demand is expected to slow down in 2022 and theirLNG imports are set to fall over 14% year-on-year to 69 million tonnes (Mt) in 2022, the largest decline since it began LNG imports, says Wood Mackenzie a Verisk business (Nasdaq:VRSK). The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure that is following a boom-bust business cycle.</p> <p>M. Judith Ferguson        Tacoma, WA</p>
	Amy McKay	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon



			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Amy McKay</p>
	william IOI	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, william IOI</p>
	Claudia Harris	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

			<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Claudia Harris</p>
	Geff Ratcheson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Geff Ratcheson</p>
	Judah Easley	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Judah Easley</p>
Greg Wingard	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Greg Wingard</p>
	Virgene Link-New	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>



- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Virgene Link-New
	Kathy Phelps	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathy Phelps</p>
	priscilla martinez	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>We need to take better care of what is left of our environment, for wildlife, marine life, plant life, and people.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			priscilla martinez
	S. Schwenger	Email	<p>Commissioners Danner, Doumit, and Rendahl,</p> <p>I am writing today to urge you to reject the rate increase requests by Puget Sound Energy (PSE), which are asking customers to pay rates that are much too high for electricity and methane gas.</p> <p>Washington families are struggling right now as pocketbook expenses—from gasoline to milk and bread, and now utilities—soar higher. The rate increases requested by PSE would make utility costs even less affordable for ratepayers already struggling to pay their bills, especially as real wages have failed to keep pace with inflation.</p> <p>According to NPR, the National Energy Assistance Directors Association (NEADA) says more than 20 million families have fallen behind on their utility bills and the average amount they owe has grown to \$792 — nearly double what it was before the pandemic.</p> <p>"It's not a question of are families heating and cooling their homes responsibly," Wolfe says. "Families do this. They turn the heat down as low as they can. They use air conditioning sparingly. It's just that the cost of home heating and home cooling has gone up so much that low-income families are struggling to pay these bills" (NPR.org).</p> <p>Particularly troubling is that PSE has failed to justify the extent of the rate increases they request. In the "Notice of requested changes to PSE rates and public hearings," PSE cites a number of exceptionally vague reasons for the rate increases. PSE owes all of us detailed explanations, especially as so many Washingtonians struggle to pay their bills. I urge you, as part of your due diligence to ratepayers, to demand specific details of the rate increase requests. The rate increases do not appear to be reasonable and fair—they seem targeted at maximizing profits to the extent of the law.</p> <p>As a ratepayer, some questions I have around PSE's requests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Do the rate increase requests pertain to recovering costs to serve Washington ratepayers specifically, or to recovering costs to serve ratepayers elsewhere, or a mix of both? If the increases are to cover costs elsewhere, who should Washingtonians foot the bill for these?</li><li>• Which state mandates is PSE referring to when they refer to the increased costs of compliance to "decarbonize"?</li><li>• What evidence has PSE provided you, the Commission, in the form of a financial statements, balance sheets, and/or audits or reports, to indicate that the cost of providing electricity and methane gas to Washington State ratepayers specifically, has increased?</li><li>• What specific capital and operating investments has PSE made in Washington State that they've been unable to recoup under current rates?</li></ul> <p>I haven't received a raise in nearly 3 years, despite legitimate justification. PSE definitely doesn't deserve approval to raise rates, especially to such high levels, without first providing rationale for why their requests are fair, just, and reasonable given improvements made or increased costs incurred specifically in Washington State.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			S. Schwenger Kirkland
Stephanie Trasoff	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephanie Trasoff</p>
	Suzan Hirz	Email	<p>I am writing to oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increase for natural gas service. I am strongly opposed to PSE's request to increase their authorized return on equity. For too long, PSE has been pursuing projects that maximize profits for shareholders at the expense of local residents. While pursuing these dubious projects, such as the Tacoma LNG facility, PSE has failed to focus on the critical need to transition to clean energy. Ideally, we would be able to receive essential services through public utilities. Until that time comes, please put the brakes on PSE's excessive focus on shareholder greed at the expense of customers and the climate.</p> <p>Thank you, Suzan Hirz University Place, WA</p>
	Lyn Shahan	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lyn Shahan</p>
	Nancy Peacock	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,      Nancy Peacock</p>
	Richard Verbree	Email	<p>PSE does not generate the electricity they sell, so why do they ask for and get rate increases?, I live in rural whatcom county, the power poles are mostly old and many lean, the electrical infrastructure is ancient in appearance, we pay highest or near highest rates in Washington State, there has not been actual humans meter readers in nearly 2 decades now, so I would like PSE to answer why they deserve more and more and more and more \$ for electricity that they do not generate?</p> <p>Also, is PSE a foreign owe'd company?, and if so that should be illegal, it angers me that a foreign entity-people get rich off our electricity, bad enough if it a US based fat hog corporation milking us</p>
	deb kalahan	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p>

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, deb kalahan</p>
	Karen Sheflo	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Karen Sheflo</p>
	<p>ELIZABETH SLOSS</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, ELIZABETH SLOSS</p>
	Sheri Jacobson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed rate hike for several reasons. It involves reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas. My home state of Oklahoma has had significant earthquake activity due to fracking. Fracking also causes major environmental damage due to injection and disposal of waste water. As a PSE customer, I do not want my money to go projects that involve fracking, coal, or "natural" gas, which in reality is methane. PSE should be moving to electric heat pumps, particularly since state and government regulations will eventually phase out natural gas. To protect our environment, this rate hike should be denied.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sheri Jacobson</p>
	Scott Fortman	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,



			Scott Fortman
	Erick Dowell	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Erick Dowell</p>
	Sophia Sattar	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sophia Sattar</p>
Jean Pauley	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jean Pauley</p>
	Abigail Houghton	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Abigail Houghton</p>
	Malika Mohseni	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Malika Mohseni</p>
	Derek Benedict	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE).</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			Thank you, Derek Benedict
Florie Rothenberg	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate:	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Florie Rothenberg</p>
	Joyce Grajczyk	Email <p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Joyce Grajczyk

	Monica dewald	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Monica dewald</p>
	Teresa Allen	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Teresa Allen</p>
	Donald Wilson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Donald Wilson</p>
	David Hirst	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Hirst</p>
	Sari Schneider	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sari Schneider</p>
Denee Scribner	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Denee Scribner</p>
	A Rosen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>A Rosen</p>
	Pam Schell	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Pam Schell</p>
	Patrick J. Mulcahey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Patrick J. Mulcahey</p>
	Ann Dorsey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ann Dorsey</p>
	Michael Leff	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michael Leff</p>
	Dan Snyder	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dan Snyder</p>
Candice Cassato	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Candice Cassato</p>
	Nicholas Heyer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nicholas Heyer</p>
Joy Hamby	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Joy Hamby</p>
Jamie Kitson	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jamie Kitson</p>
	Steven Yantorni	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>



			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Steven Yantorni</p>
	Betty McNiel	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Betty McNiel</p>
April Brow	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, April Brow</p>
	Linda Wasserman	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Linda Wasserman
Ellen Madsen	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Ellen Madsen</p>
	<p>Susan Finley</p> <p>Email</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li> <li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li> </ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Susan Finley



	Randall Souza	Email	<p>Oppose. PSE is doing just fine, and gas is phasing out, so the state of Washington should be ushering that process along, not enabling PSE to build new infrastructure that will make the eventual transition more difficult. Oppose.</p> <p>Randall Souza Seattle</p>
	Hayley Elkin	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Hayley Elkin</p>
	Lori Erbs	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Lori Erbs
Mackenzie Kleiva	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mackenzie Kleiva</p>
	Feoria Rhinehart	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Feoria Rhinehart

	John S	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	--------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, John S</p>
	Patrick Conn	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is NOT NEEDED to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, HAS DIRECT AND UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT to the Puyallup Tribe, HAS UNACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IMPACTS, IS A NET CONTRIBUTOR TO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, and SETS A BAD PRECEDENT FOR HOW AN ENERGY FACILITIES CAN GREENWASH PROJECTS. To this end, I urge you to please deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>



			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I URGE YOU TO DENY PRUDENCE of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Patrick Conn</p>
	Dora Weyer	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dora Weyer</p>
	Caroline Allen	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Caroline Allen</p>
	Michelle Fairow	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michelle Fairow</p>
Faye Bartlett	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Faye Bartlett</p>
	Bonnie Miller	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to



			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Bonnie Miller</p>
	Andrea Avni	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Andrea Avni</p>
	Nannette Gonnella	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Carol Follett	Email	<p>Raising our utility bill by a net of 12.9% for electricity and 11.9% for natural gas would severely impact our household of older residents on a fixed income. Our costs are increasing in every necessary service from water to energy as well as food and fuel prices, but our income is not increasing at the same rate. The high costs of necessities causes anxiety, and it impacts our ability to contribute to our local economy with discretionary spending or sharing with charities.</p> <p>Exorbitantly increasing the profit of CEOs and other stockholders, many of whom do not reside in our state, comes at a serious cost to the health and well being of our family, neighbors, and communities.</p> <p>Please do not allow this rate increase.</p>
	Joseph Puchot	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>What do you plan to tell your children?</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Joseph Puchot
	tom barlet	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>tom barlet</p>
	Harry Gerecke	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Harry Gerecke</p>
J Mcconaughey	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, J McConaughy</p>
	Heather Murawski	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>



Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Heather Murawski</p>
Bronwen Evans	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Bronwen Evans</p>
	Dennis Underwood	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Dennis Underwood
Dorothy Jordan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p> <p>Thank you, Dorothy Jordan</p>
Robert Brown	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Robert Brown
Dwight Rousu	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	



			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dwight Rousu</p>
	Tom Craighead	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Tom Craighead</p>
	Brendi Turner	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas

			<p>(LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Brendi Turner</p>
	Christopher Murphy	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Christopher Murphy

	Leslie McClure	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Leslie McClure</p>
	Stephanie Barbee	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephanie Barbee</p>
	Diane Bisset	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Diane Bisset</p>
	Jeannie Keyes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jeannie Keyes</p>
	Gregory Penchoen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gregory Penchoen</p>
Debra Jensen	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Debra Jensen</p>
	Tina Brown	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tina Brown</p>
Trischa Lohr Barlet	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Trischa Lohr Barlet</p>
Deborah Ramos	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving



			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Deborah Ramos</p>
	Claudia Sellmaier	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Claudia Sellmaier</p>
	Susan Shouse	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Susan Shouse</p>
Andrea Speed	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Andrea Speed</p>
Kathy McFall-Butler	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Kathy McFall-Butler
George Summers	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, George Summers</p>
	Carol Sibley E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>



facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Carol Sibley

	Catherine Suter	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Catherine Suter</p>
David Arntson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Arntson</p>
	William Falk	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Falk</p>
	Lin Swanson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lin Swanson</p>
	Katherine Nelson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so



			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Katherine Nelson</p>
Natalie Niblack	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Natalie Niblack</p>
	Shary B	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Shary B</p>
Frederick Duhring	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Frederick Duhring</p>
	Debbie Spear	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Debbie Spear
	Paul Ferrari	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Ferrari</p>
	Loretta Seppanen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>I write as a PSE rate payer and an advocate for positions of local tribes. Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>



barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Loretta Seppanen

	Lyle Anderson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lyle Anderson</p>
	TRISTIN JONES	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, TRISTIN JONES</p>
	Laura Zerr	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laura Zerr</p>
	Deborah Rushing	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Deborah Rushing</p>
	meredith berlin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so



			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, meredith berlin</p>
Julia Zelman	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). I ask you to deny the Tacoma LNG project, an unnecessary and harmful new facility that will hurt the Puyallup Tribe, increase greenhouse gas emissions, and force costs on ratepayers despite the fact that only one to two percent of the gas produced will benefit them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Julia Zelman</p>
	Thomas Cox	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Thomas Cox

	Twylia Westling	Email	<p>Dear Executive Director Maxwell,</p> <p>I'm writing to state my opposition to the rate increase that Puget Sound Energy is requesting.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Washington state for over 30 years, and a Tacoma resident for the last 15 years. My family ties to Washington state run deep.</p> <p>For six years I have stood with The Puyallup Tribe of Indians and my neighbors to oppose the LNG refinery being built on Commencement Bay. If I recall correctly, one of the conditions that the UTC imposed upon PSE when initially approving the project, was a prohibition on recovering costs from the ratepayers. I hope to lay out a clear and concise analysis of my opposition to this request.</p> <p>PSE has stated that they seek this rate increase for the reasons noted below, and following each reason I will provide my justification for opposing this rate increase.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To continue to provide safe and reliable energy sources to the ratepayers</li></ol> <p>Safety and reliability ought to be a foundational mandate for a public utility. PSE has had at least two rate increases in the last couple of years and I think it is safe to assume that a portion of that increase should have also funded safety and reliability initiatives. Why are they now coming for nearly 17%? Are they that far behind in their safety and reliability initiatives? According to their annual reliability reports, it appears that PSE has not improved on its reliability in the last ten years. How is this allowed to continue?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. To meet state mandates for decarbonization and to meet the expectations of ratepayers</li></ol> <p>Same principle stated above – decarbonization and delivery of safe, clean energy sources ought to be a public utility's major foundational mission, especially in the face of the evidence of climate chaos. For six years I have stood with others against the LNG project, and we have been consistent in our message that the methane generated by fracked gas is more dangerous than clean. According to the Environmental Defence Fund, methane's global warming potential is measured at 84, meaning it traps 84 times more heat per mass than carbon dioxide. Again, why is PSE now coming after a double-digit rate increase, after having ignored the voices and the evidence over the last 6 years? Because of companies like PSE, the mandates for clean air and clean water will become more costly. Communities will suffer under the effects of climate chaos. What will PSE do for the ratepayers then? Ask for more money? When ratepayers have lost their homes, will they still be expected to pay so that PSE can finally start working toward decarbonization?</p> <p>The pollution generated by the Tacoma LNG refinery is going to disproportionately affect marginalized and underserved communities, especially the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants held at the NW Detention Center. PSE has continued to anchor the ratepayers to projects that will exacerbate climate chaos and environmental</p>
--	-----------------	-------	--

injustice. AND THEN ASK US TO FUND IT.

3. Specifically to recover more than four years of capital and operating investments

This reason is equally repugnant. The costs of capital and operating investments include: the LNG facility, the Energize Eastside project, and the Lakehills Transmission Line. PSE has ignored community opposition on all these projects, moved them forward, and then has the audacity to make the public pay for those projects. PSE's investments into fossil fuel projects are short-sighted and irresponsible. As ratepayers start to realize the devastation of fossil fuel extraction and usage, they are starting to shift to more environmentally sustainable energy sources. My family is currently evaluating our options for removing gas usage in our home.

4. To increase their return on investment from 9.4% to 9.9%

Of all the reasons listed, this is perhaps the most audacious. This is an astonishing example of the inequality that historically exists in these conversations. Ratepayers who oppose projects are forced to bear the brunt of the costs, rendered voiceless and without agency. The UTC is supposed to be the agency watching out for the ratepayers. I ask you to consider the enormous economic disparity this creates by giving PSE's investors a financial 'leg up' while the ratepayers are left holding the bag

PSE has built their LNG refinery directly across from Chinook Landing, an economic investment of The Puyallup Tribe of Indians. As far as I know, the City of Tacoma has yet to do a safety evaluation of the refinery. I live about a mile away, as the crow flies, and any kind of breach of the facility would have a serious impact on my life. But an event would have a devastating economic and environmental impact on the Puyallup people. The people live within a three-mile radius of the refinery and are subject to the emissions.

I can't stress enough the importance of rigor and accountability in these regards. Just this week alone there have been two major fire incidents at the port. I live a mile away, as the crow flies, and am affected by the air anytime something happens. I, and others, live daily with the knowledge that industry continually receives opportunities to impose their will on residents and ratepayers, without living under the fear of environmental destruction or long term health impacts.

In summary, I want to make sure it is clear how I view this. PSE comes to the UTC to ask for money during an economic uncertainty that the average ratepayer has no protection against. Additionally, PSE has continued to ignore the will of its customer base, and moved forward on projects that create more environmental instability. I implore you to consider my words, and the words of any other ratepayers who raise their voices in opposition to this requested rate increase.

			<p>Miigwech (thank you) Twylia Westling, MPA</p> <p>-- Twylia Westling, MPA The 'i' is silent; I'm not.</p>
Victoria Urias	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Victoria Urias</p>
	Kathy Mallalieu	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			Thank you, Kathy Mallalieu
Laurie Schaetzel- Hill	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laurie Schaezel-Hill</p>
	marcy williams	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
marcy williams

	Jean Johnson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	--------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jean Johnson</p>
	Tracy Wang	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tracy Wang</p>
	Giles Sydnor	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Giles Sydnor</p>
	Grace Padelford	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Grace Padelford</p>
	Bonny Headley	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Bonny Headley</p>
Gary Gill	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gary Gill</p>
	Irene Bensinger	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Irene Bensinger</p>
	Edris Jorgensen	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is NOT needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Edris Jorgensen</p>
	Donna Gillespie	Email	<p>I disapprove of a rate increase for PSE on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. I am tired of flickering lights, power surges and 'interruptions' (not 'actionable' by legal definition - as 'power failure'.) The People of Washington, need and deserve NOW: a reliable supply and cheaper system of power IN EACH COMMUNITY. **</li><li>2. PSE is unwieldy and expensive as a power distribution system: Long distances-Distribution Methods/Centralization of distribution: Vagaries of weather/ Each part vulnerable to computer hacking. PSEs mgmt/ownership structure/centralized bureaucracy: lacks flexibility to innovate and respond to changes.</li><li>3. PSE has a conflict-of-interest with the people and communities of Washington: It is owned and profits from rate-hikes, and its' management is approved by, a for-profit company responsible to shareholders not the taxpayers of Washington.</li><li>4 . PSE has a conflict-of-interest with 'competition' to PSE. e.g. solar or wind turbines owned/operated by landowners not allowed in Washington. In Scotland, Ireland and U.K., almost every farm has its own wind turbine(s) + solar. Communities need LOCAL GRIDS.** (less weather/hacking issues)</li><li>6. After recent Supreme Court decisions, Texas Freeze Meltdowns'/Brownouts /Overheated Power Grids may now be possible in Washington State. Last rate-hike request, I was informed "Federal Regulations would prevent that scenario from happening here". Since then, recent Supreme Court decisions restricted</li></ol>

			<p>Federal Government Regulations, regulations which protect communities from Businesses putting Profit over communities and people.</p> <p>7. PSE too slow for today's changing climate. Technology is available. Manpower is available. People are ready. LET'S DO IT in each community NOW!</p> <p>For these reasons I do not approve of a rate hike for PSE without a forceful, and well publicized, Climate-Responsive** plan for immediate implementation in local communities. NATURE isn't waiting!</p> <p>** Local Community Grids/individual ownership for wind-turbines/solar: PSE buy-backs &amp; PSE legal Assistance for Local 'Zoning/codes,etc' Objections. We deserve a reliable, cheaper and better power supply system NOW.</p> <p>Donna Gillespie</p>
	Linda Erickson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>



			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Linda Erickson</p>
	Gena DiLabio	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gena DiLabio</p>
Barbara O'Steea	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara O'Steea</p>
	Patricia Holm	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			<p>Thank you, Patricia Holm</p>
Julie Stone	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Julie Stone</p>
	Ji-Young Kim	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Ji-Young Kim



Keith Dunavant	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Keith Dunavant</p>
Rebecca Glass	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Rebecca Glass</p>
Julie Martinson	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Julie Martinson	
Emily Withrow	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable	

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Emily Withrow</p>
	Jean Schwinberg	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jean Schwinberg</p>
	Sara Burgess	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sara Burgess</p>
Lynda Jackson	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lynda Jackson</p>
	wiliam weathersby	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, wiliam weathersby</p>
Stephen Thompson	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephen Thompson</p>
	Heather Misener	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Heather Misener
	Michelle Mood	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Michelle Mood</p>
	Margaret Donaldson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). I hope you'll consider my comment as a PSE ratepayer and resident of the state of Washington.</p> <p>The Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas facility should never have been built before permits and community &amp; safety reviews were completed. There are more problems: the record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, it has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, it has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, it is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and finally, it</p>

sets a bad precedent for how energy utilities could greenwash projects. I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project for a few important reasons: to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project, because it harms the planet and increases the hazards of climate change, and because it disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change. It is also possible that the state of Washington will make such a rule change for new construction within the state, as other states are also considering.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds.
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area. This puts this disproportionately-impacted community at even greater risk.

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next two decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change. When methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline-powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of this expensive, hasty and poorly conceived project.</p> <p>Thank you, Margaret Donaldson</p>
	Katherine Holmes	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Katherine Holmes</p>
	James Wiley	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, James Wiley</p>
Dre Say	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dre Say</p>
	Tamara Kustka	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tamara Kustka</p>
Paul Roberts	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Roberts</p>
	Celeste Maris	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). This facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, PSE's proposed facility would have direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, and the proposed facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts--it would be a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and it would set a bad precedent. I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project and to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project, which harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1-2% of the total gas produced at the facility will</li></ul>

be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use. The investors should bear the financial burden.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, including greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk
- This facility would be located next to I-5, a major interstate freeway, which could be impacted by events at the facility.
- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit about the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project and to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project.

Thank you,  
Celeste Maris



	Adam Yoshida	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	--------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Adam Yoshida</p>
	Mira Latoszek	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mira Latoszek</p>
	Dean McBee	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dean McBee</p>
Aliesha Wallach	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Aliesha Wallach</p>
	Florence and Kenneth Robinson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Florence and Kenneth Robinson</p>
	Mary Ferm	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li> <li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will</li> </ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Mary Ferm



	Carl Olson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carl Olson</p>
Beverly Parsons	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	<p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Beverly Parsons</p>
	Anita Scheunemann	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Anita Scheunemann</p>
	Maria Lubienski	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Maria Lubienski</p>
	Alyce Fritch	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Alyce Fritch</p>
Elizabeth award	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Elizabeth award</p>
	Christian Chabot	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Christian Chabot</p>
	Hilke Faber	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Hilke Faber</p>
	Lael White	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lael White</p>
	Don Williams	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Don Williams</p>
	Kate Richter	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Kate Richter</p>
	Deanna Iff	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Deanna Iff</p>
	Janet Jordan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p>



Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Janet Jordan</p>
	Brandie Deal	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Brandie Deal</p>
	Karen Fortier	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Karen Fortier</p>
	Bridget Galati	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has made a profit for decades and should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers.</li><li>• PSE is requesting an increase in authorized Return on Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9%. This is not sustainable for their rate payers and is an exceedingly high guaranteed return.</li><li>• During this time of exceedingly high inflation, it is incumbent on government agencies to reign in increased profiteering by corporations.</li><li>• The Washington State Attorney General (AGO) has provided expert testimony to OPPOSE this rate increase. ( <a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista">https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista</a> )<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o AGO's experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified. PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent.</li><li>o The experts also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers, being approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates.</li></ul></li><li>• These rate increases will adversely impact low-income households exactly as inflation and housing costs are also rising.</li></ul> <p>Thank you, Bridget Galati</p>
	Cornelia Teed	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Cornelia Teed</p>
Marianne Edain	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Marianne Edain</p>
	Jo Harvey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>



		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jo Harvey</p>
Christina dyson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Christina dyson</p>
	E. O'Halloran	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			E. O'Halloran
	Angie Dixon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Angie Dixon</p>
	Jennifer Keller	Email	<p>These comments are for Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067.</p> <p>Dear UTC commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on PSE's rate hike request, and for your work overseeing PSE and other utilities in Washington. I live at 115 - 146th Ave SE, Bellevue, 98007. I am a PSE ratepayer. Please deny PSE's requests to pass along to ratepayers the costs of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility</li><li>• Energize Eastside</li></ul> <p>These projects are unnecessary, damaging, expensive, poorly conceived projects that do not benefit ratepayers. PSE has gone ahead with them even without all the necessary permits or public process, and has assumed they can push the projects through and then force ratepayers to pay for them. This is unacceptable, and encourages other companies to try the same tactics.</p> <p>For the Tacoma LNG Facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has never proven the need. Demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in response to climate change.</li><li>• The facility provides almost no benefit to ratepayers. PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. But they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. This is clearly unfair.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels, not benefit ratepayers. This is also</li></ul>

clearly unfair. Ratepayers should not be forced to pay for a fueling facility for marine ships.

- The project harms the surrounding communities, and goes against our state's commitments to address environmental justice. It brings direct, extremely negative impacts and risks to both the Puyallup Tribe and the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area. It puts these disproportionately impacted communities at even greater risk. Why should ratepayers be forced to pay for breaking our commitments to environmental justice?
- The project goes directly against Washington state efforts to reduce carbon emissions and make a transition to a low-carbon economy. It is wrong to require ratepayers to finance actions that will destroy the future of the young people alive today.

For Energize Eastside:

- PSE has never proven the need; the electrical demand on the Eastside isn't high enough. PSE claims that the project is needed, often by talking about all the growth on the Eastside, and then saying things about having "to keep up." It sounds plausible, because we all know that there's a lot of growth. But there is also a lot of energy conservation happening. We just don't waste energy at the rate we used to.

So we must look at electricity demand data. Both PSE's data (and by the way, Seattle City Light's), show that energy demand in our area has been growing extremely slowly. I'm aware that in the past, PSE repeatedly projected a significant growth in peak electricity demand, in IRPs submitted to you, the Washington UTC. And then their projections would turn out to be significantly too high, and they would have to adjust them downwards. This happened multiple times. Thank you for telling them this is not acceptable. What the data actually shows is that energy demand has been growing extremely slowly. We have time to look at our many options for dealing with this slow growth in demand. Ratepayers should not be forced to pay for pushing forward with Energize Eastside.

- PSE has also never proven the need for this approach to addressing electrical demand on the Eastside. PSE prepared an EIS and made a big show of inviting comment. I was one of many people who told them that they had done a poor job of examining alternatives, by doing studies that were guaranteed to put a number of effective, less expensive, and less destructive alternatives in a poor light. Did they do better studies? No. They took our comments and stuck them in an appendix in the EIS, and said that Energize Eastside must go forward. It is unfair to force ratepayers to pay for this project, when far better alternatives are available, more so every month.

Consider the period of time since Energize Eastside was first proposed in 2014. A lot of people, but not particularly PSE, have been using that time to really delve into the many other options becoming available. When you put together the many options, such as solar power, demand response, and battery storage, it becomes clearer and clearer every year that there are many other ways to make our grid more resilient--ways that are less destructive, more flexible, and much less expensive. But PSE presses on with Energize Eastside as if these possibilities don't even exist. Why should we pay for this unnecessary project?

I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG and Energize Eastside projects, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for these unnecessary, expensive, harmful, and poorly conceived projects.

Thank you.

			Jennifer Keller
	Marcy Golde	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>



			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Marcy Golde</p>
	Bruce Walton	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Bruce Walton</p>
	Robert Oxborrow	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas

			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Robert Oxborrow</p>
	Nancy Osmundson	Email	<p>**See attached comment**</p> <p>To whom it may concern at UTC;</p> <p>I am a lifelong customer of PSE. I disagree with, and dispute the increase. In light of the current economic crisis the amount that PSE is trying to gain is too high! PSE wants their ROE, to increase from 9.4% to 9.9%. These increases over a three-year period are exorbitant, a 19.62% increase for electricity; a 17.08% increase in natural gas. Even though they are to be spread over a three-year period. It still ends up coming out of my pocket as an expense. NO THANK-YOU!!</p> <p>Three years, is way too fast, and PSE is asking way too much.</p>

			<p>In my opinion, this will create a hardship for all the citizens of the service area. Not just those working for minimum wages.</p> <p>For, example: My operating cost are dramatically rising. Yet my income is not. If you put these increases into place, I will struggle to pay my utility bill.</p> <p>Inflation is on the rise, and salaries are not rising to meet the minimum needs for the citizens. Where are we to find that extra money in an already restricted budget?</p> <p>Please protect the pocketbooks of those of us who are either on a fixed income, or currently are experiencing financial hardships due to the current state of the economy. And furthermore, due to the hardships following the pandemic.</p> <p>I would hope the UTC will review some of the citizens' complaints logged against PSE over the past three years. You may be appalled; at the strong-arm tactics they have used against some of their own "customers".</p> <p>I suggest that PSE either, recover their operating costs spread out over a much longer period of time, or consider a lesser amount of a rate increase.</p> <p>Time for the UTC to put a stop to PSE's requested rate adjustments!</p> <p>UTC just say NO! Nancy Osmundson</p>
	Wanda Unger	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Wanda Unger
Kimberly Teraberry	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kimberly Teraberry</p>
	Thomas Gilmore	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Thomas Gilmore



	William Goodwin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Goodwin</p>
	Nova Berkshires	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma. We MUST prioritize the greater good for the whole community including environmental, human and economic and focus on better together without increasing financial profits.</p> <p>Thank you, Nova Berkshires</p>
Joe Ross	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Joe Ross</p>
	Kristen Meston	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>As a PSE ratepayer and community member, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Kristen Meston</p>
	<p>Phebe Schwartz</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Phebe Schwartz</p>
	Debby Herbert	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>



			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Debby Herbert</p>
Linda Dodson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Linda Dodson</p>
Craig Swanson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Craig Swanson</p>
John Thompson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, John Thompson
Nancy Shumate	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Shumate</p>
	Arline Hinckley	Email <p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Arline Hinckley



	Nancy Matthew	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	------------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Matthew</p>
	Martha Campbell	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Martha Campbell</p>
	Sharon Dunn	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Additionally PSE is a monopoly for profit company that I have no choice but to use. The rates are outrageous and their service unreliable.</p> <p>Thank you, Sharon Dunn</p>
	Alana Khayat	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Alana Khayat</p>
	Alex Fay	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Alex Fay</p>
	Caitlyn Wolfgang	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>



			Caitlyn Wolfgang Sonora, California 95370
	Timothy Leadingham	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Timothy Leadingham</p>
	Noreen Fujita-Sacco	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>among other things, I have read in the news that this work began without any approval by authorities. I have also read from multiple sources that gas utilities are not as environmentally friendly as we are led to believe. In fact, some areas are promoting removing appliances.</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Noreen Fujita-Sacco
Barbara Wight	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara Wight</p>
	Shauna boyd	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Shauna boyd</p>
	Timothy Boyd	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Timothy Boyd</p>
	Robert Meyer	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Meyer</p>
	Victoria hall	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Victoria hall</p>
	Aminah Lamb-McMurray	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Aminah Lamb-McMurray</p>
	John Gieser	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, John Gieser</p>
Dagmar Fabian	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dagmar Fabian</p>
	Elisa McGee	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			Thank you, Elisa McGee
C Creager	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, C Creager</p>
	Ethel Renner	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Ethel Renner

	Sandra Gehri-Bergman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sandra Gehri-Bergman</p>
	Vincent Feliciano	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vincent Feliciano</p>
	Linda Kroeger	Phone	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Why should ratepayers be penalized for the bad decisions and reckless building without permits? The management should pay for their own mistakes!!!</p> <p>Thank you, Linda Kroeger</p>
	Lynne Bannerman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>



			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,      Lynne Bannerman</p>
	Roger Martin	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li><li>• There was no adequate study or evaluation of the known hazards of building on top of shoreline landfill in the presence of rising sea levels and what was done to acknowledge and/or mitigate those hazards. Nor was there any adequate study or evaluation of the further known hazard of substrate liquefaction of the loose silt that goes down from 1500 to 2000 feet under the landfill before it comes in contact with the Tacoma Earthquake Fault. And there was no discussion about how PSE is not financially responsible for any fires or explosions that might come from the collapse of the LNG facility and the subsequent breakage of the natural gas line that also runs through the landfill to take gassified natural gas to the facility.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Roger Martin</p>
	Janet Riordan	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Janet Riordan</p>
	Nick Engelfried	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nick Engelfried</p>
	Richard Johnson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Richard Johnson</p>
	mia heavyrunner	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, mia heavyrunner</p>
Clayton Jones	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Clayton Jones</p>
	Eric Holtz	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Eric Holtz</p>
Carolyn Gregg	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carolyn Gregg</p>
	Sarah Campbell	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Sarah Campbell
JoAnna Redman-Smith	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, JoAnna Redman-Smith</p>
	Ron Pike	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>



barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Ron Pike

	Melissa Miner	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	-------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Melissa Miner</p>
	Daniel Henling	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Daniel Henling</p>
	Deborah Bancroft	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Deborah Bancroft</p>
	Tom Sheehan Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tom Sheehan</p>
	Carina Hussing	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so



			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carina Hussing</p>
Jared Howe	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jared Howe</p>
	Steve Shapiro	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Steve Shapiro</p>
Edward Mills	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Edward Mills</p>
	Estelle Seeley	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Estelle Seeley
	Tom Weir	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tom Weir</p>
	Carrie Heron	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carrie Heron</p>
	James Ploger	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, James Ploger</p>
	Kathy Andeway	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathy Andeway</p>
	Wally Bubelis	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Wally Bubelis</p>
Jane Miller	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Why was PSE allowed to begin construction on this facility two years before proper permits were obtained? Why were they held above the law in this aspect?</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jane Miller
	Silus Marleau	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Silus Marleau</p>
	Liselotte Silk	Email	<p>This proposed rate change will hit seniors like me very hard. It is not reasonable to increase our utilities by that much. We are not short of gas or electric if we are allowed to use what we have in the sea and ground. It's all well and good to try to go green but it should not be at the cost of the citizens of this country. Electric cars are using energy and car owners are getting it still free at the charging stations.</p> <p>Liselotte Silk Blaine, WA 98230</p>
	Kim Dobson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>



Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Kim Dobson</p>
	Fred Walls	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Fred Walls</p>
	Robert Kenny	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Kenny</p>
	Michelle Pavcovic <	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michelle Pavcovich</p>
Mary Orrange	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

			<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mary Orrange</p>
	Dianna MacLeod	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Dianna MacLeod</p>
	Brie Gyncild	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>



This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Brie Gyncild</p>
Deborah Kaye	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Deborah Kaye</p>
	John Dunn	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			John Dunn
Delmar Fadden	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Delmar Fadden</p>
Julie Rodgers	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Julie Rodgers</p>
	Debbie Thorn	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere



			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Debbie Thorn</p>
	Virginia Davis	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed. Demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area, and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk.</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Virginia Davis</p>
	Carol Porter	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carol Porter</p>
	Nicholas Schiaffino	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nicholas Schiaffino</p>
	Christina Davis	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Christina Davis</p>
Gwendolyn Knechtel	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>We are stewards of our Earth and our beloved PNW. Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gwendolyn Knechtel</p>
Lindsay Taylor	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>



- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Lindsay Taylor
Matthew Boguske	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has a direct and unacceptable impact on the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and a poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: •PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections to combat climate change. •PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost when they will barely benefit at all from its use. •The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.  This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: •Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds; •The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes. •This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches, and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk  This facility harms our climate:	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>•LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>•As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline-powered cars annually.</li><li>•Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harm and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and a poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Matthew Boguske</p>
	Betty Williams	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Betty Williams

	Matt Lennon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Matt Lennon</p>
	Douglas Gemmell	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Douglas Gemmell</p>
	Jerry Wheeler	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jerry Wheeler</p>
	Sharyn Pennington	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sharyn Pennington</p>
	Tania Maxfield	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tania Maxfield</p>
Linda Avinger	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Linda Avinger</p>
	Miranda Marti	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Miranda Marti</p>
Tim Bernthal	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tim Bernthal</p>
	Emily Willoughby	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>



will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Emily Willoughby
Anthony Cody	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Anthony Cody</p>
	Amanda Overstreet	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Amanda Overstreet</p>
	Tina McKim	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tina McKim</p>
	Mary Jeffrey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mary Jeffrey</p>
	Jenna Carodiskey-Wiebe	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jenna Carodiskey-Wiebe</p>
	Analeigh Smith	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Analeigh Smith</p>
	David Habib	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Habib</p>
Noah Ehler	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Noah Ehler</p>
	Bob Schuessler	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Bob Schuessler
Kathleen Allen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathleen Allen</p>
	David Parker	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE).</p> <p>This is an old-school scam from the era of "fossil fuels forever." We're in a whole new paradigm now, one in which it's a gross breach of fiduciary duty to invest more in last century's energy source.</p> <p>That PSE wants ratepayers to pay for 40X what we'll get out of the deal gives the game away.</p> <p>To add atavistic insult to injury, this plan adds more to the burden placed on the Puyallup Tribe since the time this state was settled. It's unconscionable to further burden them.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly endorse the WEC's letter below. Please see this boodoggle for what it is and hold PSE responsible.</p> <p>~~~~~`</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and</p>



unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Parker</p>
	Leslie Hemmerling	Email	<p>Why the insane proposed rate increase??? I vote for this NOT to happen. That is way too high of an increase. I think people are getting a little out of hand with this "INFLATION" word big time. There is no need for this increase.</p> <p>Leslie Hemmerling</p>
	S.M. Hoff	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        S.M. Hoff</p>
	Robb Krehbiel	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

		<p>PSE's LNG facility is outrageous and illegal. LNG is a pipe dream - a fossil fuel that further keeps us beholden to polluting industries. The LNG facility was built illegally on the Puyallup Tribal Land without their consent or approval.</p> <p>Shame on PSE for pretending they care about the environment. Shame on them for perpetuating environmental racism. And shame on them for making rate payers pay for their illegal, polluting boondoggle.</p> <p>PSE should be held responsible for all of the pollution they have caused. Ultimately, they should be required to tear down their LNG facility.</p> <p>Thank you, Robb Krehbiel</p>
Kelsey G	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kelsey G</p>
	christopher Grannis	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, christopher Grannis</p>
Alyssa Parker	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Alyssa Parker</p>

	Gwen Parker	Email	<p>Please don't give PSE the raise it is asking for. I am retired and on a fixed income. Inflation is really hurting my ability to stay in my home. I don't need this powerful group getting more of my money.</p> <p>Gwen Parker</p>
	Annette Fails	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>



			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Annette Fails</p>
	Holly Graham	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>You know the facts!</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It's useless and unnecessary! For many reasons clear to you.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>You know the risks, and it is time to step up for the future, not for the profits of a private power company, and SAY NO TO THIS STUPID AND UNNECESSARY DANGER TO US ALL.</p> <p>PLEASE.</p> <p>Thank you, Holly Graham</p>
	Norma Hutmacher	Email	The proposed increases would be a major burden for people on fixed incomes, especially our seniors. Inflation hits all of us and I believe these percentages are out of line.

			<p>Please reconsider this action. I understand the need for increases, but not this dramatic.</p> <p>Regards, Norma Hutmacher</p>
	Jim MacQueen	Email	<p>We are opposed to any utility rate increases, at least at this time. While we acknowledge that current rates are relatively low, the timing of increases and their effect on poorer people and those of us who are fixed incomes, such as social security would make them particularly difficult. Inflation is already hitting us in a difficult way and is predicted to get worse in the coming weeks and months. We recommend tabling the proposal for now and revisiting it when economic conditions improve.</p> <p>We look forward to participating in the upcoming meeting.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Jim MacQueen</p>
	Yonit Yogev	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Yonit Yogev</p>
	Barbara Rombold	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara Rombold</p>
	Marina Granger	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Marina Granger</p>
	Julie Andrzejewski	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). I hope you will truly give weight to the PUBLIC COMMENTS about this rate increase request.</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash</p>

projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use and **HAD NO SAY IN THE DECISION TO BUILD IT.**
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Julie Andrzejewski</p>
Jack Laskowski	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jack Laskowski</p>
	Anne Hepfer	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Anne Hepfer</p>
	Steve Zemke	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Steve Zemke</p>
	Esther Day	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>

			<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>The only reason this is being built here is FOR PROFIT for investors - here is clear a big reason: European countries have struggled to find other supplies of gas, which heats homes, generates electricity and runs factories. Poland, for example, was on track to free itself of Russian gas after working for years to secure other sources, including liquefied natural gas, or LNG, from the United States and Middle East. Germany, in contrast, is only now racing to build LNG terminals.</p> <p>This is what can happen and will happen if built on the Tideflats or our RIVER PORT.</p> <p><a href="https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=explosion+in+beirut+lebanon&amp;docid=20852260243751&amp;mid=4E53463A56598614F70C4E53463A56598614F70C&amp;view=detail&amp;FORM=VIRE">https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=explosion+in+beirut+lebanon&amp;docid=20852260243751&amp;mid=4E53463A56598614F70C4E53463A56598614F70C&amp;view=detail&amp;FORM=VIRE</a></p> <p>Esther Day</p>
	Anna Farrell-Sherman	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Anna Farrell-Sherman
	Kevin Finn	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kevin Finn</p>
	William Marsh	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>



impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts: Plus my own opinion, This is about selling LARGE AMOUNTS of LNG to foreign Countries, not fueling the diesel engine's of container ship's! The public is a lot smarter than you think today!! William C Marsh

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Marsh</p>
	Phil Harty	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Phil Harty
	Farha Parmita	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Farha Parmita          , Saint Croix Island M1R3N6</p>
	Karen Meisenburg	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

			<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Karen Meisenburg</p>
Jane Alexander	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jane Alexander</p>

	Elizabeth Harris	Email	<p>I am writing to oppose the PSE proposed rate increase.</p> <p>I am an elder on a fixed income.</p> <p>Water rates in our city of Bellingham are threatening to triple.</p> <p>Statistics say it is cheaper overall for elders to stay in their homes...but these rate increases threaten to drive us out.</p> <p>Is that any way to treat your mothers and grandmothers?</p> <p>Elizabeth Harris</p>
	Constance DeRooy	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Constance DeRooy</p>
	Sue Hudson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sue Hudson</p>
	Infinity Thompson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I have been a loyal PSE client for years now, and I cannot bare to see my electrical expenses raised. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>



		<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Infinity Thompson</p>
Jori Adkins	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>You know the facts!</p> <p>Thank you, Jori Adkins</p>
Gloria McClintock	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility in Tacoma is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to</p>

pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers.

Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma.

This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.

- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Pollution, profits, possible catastrophe for surrounding communities to service marine vessels doesn't have my consent as a ratepayer and customer of PSE.</p> <p>Thank you, Gloria McClintock</p>
	Patricia Tobar	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Patricia Tobar</p>
	Wendy Krakauer	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Wendy Krakauer</p>
	Patti Rader	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Patti Rader
	Edoh Y. Amiran	Email	<p>Dear Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I write to oppose the rate increase proposed by PSE. There are 3 issues that lead me to the opposition, namely that this increase is unfair to rate-payers, is not consistent with the market situation, and is not consistent with the way PSE pays rate-paying investors.</p> <p>At this time of increasing costs, rate payers will be greatly burdened by an increase.</p> <p>The alternatives for investors do not suggest that an increase in returns to investors are needed in order to fund PSE projects. Indeed, the current rate of return is already above those available in every sector of investment (real estate, stocks, bonds, loans).</p> <p>Finally, as customers have added solar panels in large numbers, adding to the energy supplied to PSE, the utility has not given any returns on investment to these rate-paying investors. The state of Washington did and does give incentives, and these are paid through PSE, but the utility itself does not pay these producers. It seems that PSE is concerned about returns to some investors at the expense of others.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Edoh Y. Amiran</p>
	Rebecca Campbell	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.



			<p>Thank you, Rebecca Campbell</p>
	Vickie Woo	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE).</p> <p>The record is clear. This facility is NOT needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. There needs to be consequences.</p> <p>You must deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>You already know the facts. This facility harms our community and our climate. You also know, this facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts. We do NOT need more pollution. We are at the precipice of irreparable damage to our environment.</p> <p>Do the right thing. Ensure ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vickie Woo</p>
	Kathleen Hilliard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathleen Hilliard</p>
	Nadine Wallace	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nadine Wallace</p>
	Bruce Wade	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Bruce Wade</p>
	Brenda Pickvance	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			<p>UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Brenda Pickvance West Lincoln, Ontario L0R1E0</p>
Jacquelyn Showalter	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jacquelyn Showalter</p>
	Jonathan Scanlon	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Jonathan Scanlon



	Lesley Morgan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lesley Morgan</p>
	Debby Felnagle	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Debby Felnagle</p>
	Gregry Loomis	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gregry Loomis</p>
	barbj2@gmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Debbi Pratt	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Debbi Pratt</p>
	Sarah Sherwood	Email	<p>I am a hard-working healthcare worker and member of this community with the rising cost of everything right now a lot of people struggling struggling to make it including many of my elderly and disabled clients and also I will be in that category again if you decide to increase our rates by such a large amount I don't believe that this is fair and I believe recess should come in small amounts and we should be able to find a way around such a large increase please consider this and consider the members of this community 12% is extremely ridiculous it's almost 13%, it's just insane. Please consider all community members especially the vulnerable while this is going on food costs are already so high please don't raise a necessity right before winter people need heat this is going to cause a lot of people to have disconnection notices or not be able to have the money needed to pay for other things</p>
	Penny Rowe	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.



			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Penny Rowe</p>
David Hirst	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, David Hirst</p>
	Barbara LaFayette	Email	<p>There is no justification of raising our rates for something we do not want or need. This should not be permitted</p> <p>Barbara LaFayette</p>
	Kathryn Fletcher	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). I continue to oppose the Tacoma LNG project.</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't</p>

have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

			<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathryn Fletcher</p>
	Nova Brannigan	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Nova Brannigan</p>

	Randall Collins	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for providing oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------------	-------	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Randall Collins</p>
	William Justis	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Justis</p>
	Guila Muir	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The problems with this project are many:</p>

			<p>1. It is located in an already overburdened community in the Tacoma Tideflats.</p> <p>2. The facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels with very little oversight.</p> <p>3. The facility outputs significant greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>I urge you to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, dangerous project.</p> <p>Thank you, Guila Muir</p>
William Golding	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>



			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Golding</p>
	Cathleen Gosho	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Cathleen Gosho</p>
Laura Gibbons	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,      Laura Gibbons</p>
	Sandra Rohr	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sandra Rohr</p>
	Kathryn Wood	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathryn Wood</p>
	Sara Eldridge	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sara Eldridge</p>
Sandra Whitmore	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sandra Whitmore</p>
	Andy Wadsworth	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	lloyd smouse	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This</p>

			<p>assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lloyd smouse</p>
	Sharon Burke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I am a Puget Sound Energy customer, and I am angry that they are asking for a rate increase to pay for their Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas plant. I remain opposed to that project because it was reckless to locate such a toxic plant on the banks of Puget Sound in a seismically active area, not to mention that they completely ignored objections from the Puyallup tribe, just another example of the environmental racism that is so prevalent in the fossil fuel industry. Not only was the construction of this new fossil fuel project a step in the wrong direction in stopping climate change, when a significant earthquake hits our area, the damage to this facility could be catastrophic to Puget Sound. The track record for these types of facilities is clear: methane explosions, toxic spillage into waterways and poor health outcomes, including increases in cancer rates, to people living close to them. The Tacoma LNG plant serves the maritime industry, not households, yet they want us to pay for their poor decision? This is why allowing profit-driven corporations to run local utilities is such a bad idea. We had no say in their choice to build this facility, it does not serve us, and yet we have to pay for it? You, the Utilities and Transportation Commission are our only safeguard against bad behavior by utility companies. Please protect us from this outrageous request. It is my intention to convert my home to an environmentally superior electric heat pump as soon as I am able to divest myself from Puget Sound Energy's reckless choices, but many others do not have that option. Please protect the consumer, not a profit-driven corporation. Thank you.</p> <p>Sharon Burke</p>
	Linda Capps	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Linda Capps
	Nancy Farrell	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Nancy Farrell</p>
	cheryl waitkevich	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, cheryl waitkevich</p>
Graham Hubenthal	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Graham Hubenthal</p>
	Barry Hutchinson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>



Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barry Hutchinson</p>
Brian Gunn	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Brian Gunn</p>
	mia heavyrunner	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, mia heavyrunner
Katherine Chesick	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>	

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Katherine Chesick</p>
	Alison Quinn	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Alison Quinn

	vana spear	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	------------	--------	---



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, vana spear</p>
	Karen Rogers	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Karen Rogers</p>
	Art Bogie	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Art Bogie</p>
	Barbara Foster	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara Foster</p>
	Michael rose	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michael rose</p>
Lauren Ranz	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lauren Ranz</p>
	Larry Mahlis	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>



		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Larry Mahlis</p>
	Greg Ellis	Email	<p>I am writing the proposed rate increase by PSE. An increase of 13% (+/-) for both electricity and natural gas is excessive and should not be approved. The last rate increase for PSE should have included any recent spending on capital and operating expenses but PSE's own explanation for this increase states they need to recover these expenses from the last 4 previous years. Their last increase should have included all previous expenses! It is time for the UTC to do its job which is to audit the facts offered by PSE and, most importantly, to protect the interests of the public. The UTC has been deficient in performing its duties in the past and needs to more than simply approve whatever increase is made by PSE. Do Your Job!!!</p> <p>Greg Ellis</p>
	Stephen Wagner	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Stephen Wagner</p>
	Qat Boaterre	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Qat Boaterre</p>
	Sonya Curry	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Sonya Curry
john doherty	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. john doherty	
Paul Jentlie	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I urge you to reject the request to increase power rates for Puget Sound Energy Customers. As customers, we have no option to go to another company or to go without as these costs skyrocket. This monopoly allows PSE to profit even if they make bad choices, and those that make the bad decisions are not held accountable because they can just increase our rates. It is not fair, make them pay for their mistakes, make them cut costs, make them work harder for their customers, instead of the other way around. Please don't raise our rates, stand firm and hold them accountable	

			<p>for their bad decisions.          Sincerely,          Paul Jentlie</p>
King Schoenfeld	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , We agree wholeheartedly that Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 As you know, the Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty, 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. King Schoenfeld	
Irene Boland	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.	

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Irene Boland</p>
Wayne Lloyd	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>



			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Wayne Lloyd</p> <p>Greater Napanee, Ontario K7R3K8</p>
	jovan nikolic	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>jovan nikolic</p> <p>Markham, Ontario l3t3t4</p>
Mike and Susan Raymond	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. <p>Mike and Susan Raymond</p>	
Jonathan Halperin	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate	

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jonathan Halperin</p>
	Annick Richardson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Annick Richardson</p>
	Kassie Koledin	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Kassie Koledin</p>
	Liisa Wale	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Liisa Wale</p>
	E. Neal	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>E. Neal</p>
	Abbie Bernstein	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sincerely, Abbie Bernstein</p>
	Nori Retherford	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nori Retherford</p>
	<p>vad11_11@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Elsy Shallman</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>



			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Elsy Shallman</p>
	Doris Acosta	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Doris Acosta</p>
	Steven N	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Steven N
	Marilyn Mayers	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Marilyn Mayers</p>
	Jim Bernthal	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jim Bernthal</p>
	Pat Villa	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Pat Villa</p>
	Sue Langhans	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sue Langhans</p>

Illyana Zeski	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Illyana Zeski</p>
Janice Gloe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Janice Gloe</p>
	Lowell Wyse	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>

			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lowell Wyse</p>
	Carly Johnson	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate



			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Carly Johnson</p>
	Victoria Banks	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Victoria Banks</p>
	Abdelwaheb Essaihi	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Abdelwaheb Essaihi</p>
	Wendy H. Bartlett	Email	<p>Dear Puget Sound Energy,</p> <p>In these times of inflation increases I urge you to rethink your announced rate increases exceeding 9.9% to your customers, especially those of us with fixed incomes. The application of such drastic actions will only exacerbate Washington State's homeless problem.</p> <p>Now is not the time to profit as a monopoly, especially with the cold, often harsh winter months approaching.</p> <p>Sharp rate increase will force people to choose whether to heat or eat. The citizens of Washington State and your customers deserve better.</p> <p>Finding a more publicly feasible alternative, such as pro-rating can be more helpful financially for those struggling and would certainly be appreciated by many.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Wendy H. Bartlett</p>
	Pamela Keeley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Pamela Keeley</p>
	Marilyn Bode	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        I have no choice but to get my power from PSE. Every time I pay a bill I get angry about PSE bulldozing their way onto Puyallup land and building this terrible fossil fuel producer. We need LESS fossil fuel not more. We need recognition and honoring of Tribal sovereignty. PSE customers should not be forced to pay for the LNG refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the LNG facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because they began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. You should not be rewarded for your bully tactics. You must have read the full letter from actionnetwork.org. Take it seriously. I will protest any tax or rate increase and continue to criticize PSE for its lack of customer care, environmental degradation, racism and bully tactics. No taxes or rate increases to go for fossil fuels!</p> <p>Marilyn Bode</p>
	June BlueSpruce	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. PSE has resisted pressure to produce energy using renewable technology. This hurts all of us.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          June BlueSpruce</p>
	Don Songras	Email	<p>If the a portion of the rate increase is to fund the LNG facility in Tacoma, that should be restricted or not applied to those who are not using the gas.          Please respect the rights of the Puyallup tribe.</p>
	Nathalie Hamel	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li> <li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li> </ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Nathalie Hamel
	Bradley Barton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , We never wanted this LNG tank to begin with. PSE is making money by building new gas lines--often now, just for gas stoves--which kills children by giving them asthma. They just keep building useless, dangerous stuff and charging all of us. STOP them. If they can't find their own buyers for their worthless, harmful products, let them perish. They don't need to keep charging us people every time they build something new. STOP them now. Their days are over. All they are doing anymore is killing us--yes, besides asthma, if this LNG tank explodes it will likely kill hundreds of children in the area. They harm us and then they charge us for it--because no one in their right minds would pay the true market price for their worthless, dangerous products.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities--namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Bradley Barton</p>

Rama K Paruchuri	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Rama K Paruchuri</p>
suzyque195754@gmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>



			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Sara Sledge	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I have opposed this project from the start. I find it very irritating to see branding supporting this project as "green" on company vehicles. There is a political divide on this topic and it seems really tricky to use ratepayers money to sway public political opinion as if there are no downsides to this project.</p> <p>I am continually shocked at how it seems the permit process is put to the side while construction continues. The whole idea that it is a cleaner fuel for ships is deceptive. It is cleaner than what is currently used, but it is a poor investment for the future. We should not invest in huge projects for just somewhat cleaner fuel. We all know that this LNG facility will be pushed long after truly clean alternatives are available.</p> <p>Now you find that you can't afford this project without a rate increase from customers? Stop building then. It was a bad investment from the start. Sorry shareholders. Shareholders should shoulder the loss, not ratepayers.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sara Sledge</p>
	Elsie Lamb	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that the Tacoma facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impacts on the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you: to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project; to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Elsie Lamb</p>
	Jenna Judge	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jenna Judge</p>
	Dave Doering Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Phillip Hope	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Phillip Hope</p>
	Chris Barnes	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , All the for letter is below, but personally the idea that a rate hike is need to build a new facility while PSE has other options (I’m looking at Executive Management salaries) is unconscionable.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Chris Barnes</p>
	Shary B	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Shary B</p>
	Meagan Galacgac	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>



			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Meagan Galacgac</p>
	Sylvia Rodriguez	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sylvia Rodriguez</p>
	Sandra Remilien	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sandra Remilien</p>
	The Rev. Liz Kearny	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing in advance of the 9/28 Utilities and Transportation Commission meeting (which I cannot attend) to urge the commission to reject reimbursement of the LNG refinery in Tacoma and any other fossil fuel infrastructure. Deny Puget Sound Energy's attempt to increase power rates. An increase in rates will help fund the harmful continued operation and construction of fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility that occupies the ancestral lands of the Puyallup Tribe.</p> <p>We must protect our planet. Deny PSE's attempt to further damage this place we all call home.</p> <p>Sincerely, The Rev. Liz Kearny Olympia Presbytery Presbyterian Church (USA)</p>
	Suzi Friedlander	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>

		<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Suzi Friedlander</p>
	mary n	<p>Email</p> <p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>mary n</p>
Judy D'Amore	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Judy D'Amore</p>	
K Anderson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>	

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, K Anderson</p>
sandra geist	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.	

			sandra geist
	Heidi Stephens	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Heidi Stephens</p>
	Marian Schwartz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>



			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Marian Schwartz</p>
	Carol Dugger	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Carol Dugger</p>
Laura Long	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Laura Long</p>

	Ed Cornwell	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ed Cornwell</p>
	Kathryn Boileau	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathryn Boileau</p>
	Roxanne Goddard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

		<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Roxanne Goddard</p>
Amanda Dickinson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Amanda Dickinson</p>
	Megan Christensen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Megan Christensen</p>
	Susan Carlton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Susan Carlton</p>
	Wilfredo R. Santiago	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Wilfredo R. Santiago</p>
	Ashley Ouellette	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>



			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ashley Ouellette</p>
	Virginia Dwyer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Virginia Dwyer</p>
	archie_101@hotmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Lloyd 'Ted' Siverns	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lloyd 'Ted' Siverns</p>
	Wendy Stevens	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Wendy Stevens</p>
	ehf5@yahoo.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Sally Gilbert de Vargas	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sally Gilbert de Vargas</p>

	Corey Waller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Corey Waller</p>
	Gretchen Wilkinson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gretchen Wilkinson</p>
	Davis Freeman	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>I grew up in Baton Rouge, LA. BR sits next to the Mississippi River, along the Mississippi are many industrial processing plants to include, Dow Chemical, Exxon/Mobil, and Sasol Chemical to name a few. In the 1940s, '50s and '60s residences were assured that NO pollutants were being dumped into the River or released into the air....NOW it's called "CANCER ALLEY".... Let's not turn our beautiful waterway and land into this. Here's an article from today's KOS <a href="https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2022/9/26/2125365/-EPA-s-newly-launched-environmental-justice-office-has-its-work-cut-out-for-it-in-Cancer-Alley">https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2022/9/26/2125365/-EPA-s-newly-launched-environmental-justice-office-has-its-work-cut-out-for-it-in-Cancer-Alley</a>. Please stop the development of this precious land.</p> <p>Thank you, Davis Freeman</p> <p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>



impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
lorraine garratt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>lorraine garratt</p>	
LaDonna Robertson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose the fact that PSE wants to raise rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. It's totally wrong especially when PSE is already Washington's most expensive</p>	

			<p>utility! Most people including myself are struggling and unable to pay our bills with the inflation rate being used for everything under the sun.</p> <p>Money coming from Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be used to maintain the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running BEYOND 2025 nor support big projects like the Tacoma LNG PLant at the Port of Tacoma, Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067, or any other fossil fuel investments.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely, the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects and environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. If utility corporations like PSE continue to ignore the signs of the Climate Crisis, the Port of Tacoma along with all coastal areas around our country will be under water. How do you sleep at night?</p> <p>The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. All this does is hasten the end of all living life on our planet. It only adds to those who want to make a big profit for deep pockets, which will serve no one in the end. Energy should be FREE to all residential consumers who use it in this country in order to survive as Bernie Sanders has stated time and time again.</p> <p>LaDonna Robertson</p>
C.W. Pete	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>C.W. Pete</p>
	jvaron613@aol.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Lisbeth Slabotsky	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lisbeth Slabotsky</p>
	Stephen Waller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Greedy people , energy companies and the monopolies they hold should be given to the public trust not board</p>

			<p>and ceos</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Stephen Waller</p>
	Anna Nelson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Anna Nelson</p>
	<p>nancy          traversie</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>nancy traversie</p>
	<p>Rita          Glasscock</p>		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate</p>



			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Rita Glasscock</p>
	Elizabeth Bettenhausen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Elizabeth Bettenhausen</p>
	Denice Jentlie	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Denice Jentlie</p>
	Janet Higbee-Robinson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Janet Higbee-Robinson</p>
	Briana Brannan	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Briana Brannan
	LYNNE MOORE	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Please focus efforts on creating a better present &amp; future for Native Tribes, Detainees, and us all. Please cease fracking, use of LNG, and rate increases to pay for environmental destruction.          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Thank you for your time and attention to this vitally important matter. Please respond &amp; speak out to let me and other concerned citizens know how you will act to protect our environment--the water we drink, the air we breathe, and our health.          LYNNE MOORE</p>
	Amy M	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate</p>

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Amy M</p>
Frances M	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Frances M</p>
	Vladimir Shakov	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vladimir Shakov</p>
	Edward Kaeufer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To</p>

this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Edward Kaeufer</p>
	Bruce Shilling	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

		<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Bruce Shilling</p>
	Robin Briggs	Email Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Robin Briggs</p>
	Chris Wooten	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>

			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Chris Wooten</p>
	Barbara Gomez	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Barbara Gomez</p>
	lonewolf999k@yahoo.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

		<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Sage Ahrens- Nichols	Email <u>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission</u> , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.



			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sage Ahrens-Nichols</p>
annette sandberg	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>annette sandberg</p>	
Richard Worth	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>	

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Richard Worth</p>
	Kevin Gallagher	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is that PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bullying tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider the impacts on overburdened communities in their decision-making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

		<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for the climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be a burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of the growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Thank you. Kevin Gallagher</p>
	Justin Maltry Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Justin Maltry</p>
	Yonit Yogev	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Yonit Yogev</p>
	Michelle Miller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Michelle Miller</p>
	brian simpson	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			brian simpson
	Amy Withrow	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Amy Withrow</p>
	Stacy Schwyhart	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Stacy Schwyhart</p>
	Kathy Rogers	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>



			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathy Rogers</p>
	Scott Woll	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Scott Woll</p>

			, Saint Croix Island 98423
Elizabeth White	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Elizabeth White	
Jennifer Driscoll	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began	

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jennifer Driscoll</p>
	Kay BRainerd	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kay BRainerd</p>
	Anna Markee	Email	<p>Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I am a residential Puget Sound Energy customer living in Tacoma and I oppose PSE's proposed rate increase. The primary reason I oppose the proposal is because it would burden families like mine with the cost of damaging and unwise investments in fossil fuels including the Tacoma liquified methane facility in order to increase corporate profits. I am a public sector budget and finance officer who has developed rate-setting guidance so I understand that rate increases are sometimes necessary to either keep up with rising costs or make wise investments in the future. PSE's proposal does neither of those things. I would feel very differently about paying a much higher cost for energy if my investment was going into speeding up the transition to energy efficiency and renewables but that is not the focus of PSE's proposal. In fact, I already voluntarily pay an additional fee to support wind power development. This should be in PSE's base rate-model, not paying-off debt on misguided capital investments.</p> <p>My family lives on the ancestral lands of the Puyallup tribe who are most impacted by the Tacoma liquified methane facility and have been targeted by PSE and state sanctioned violence for their efforts to protect their land and water. I cannot be complicit in PSE's efforts by providing additional funding for this polluting plant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Tacoma liquified methane facility does not even serve residential customers so it goes against basic rate-setting guidance to charge one class of users for a product provided to another class of users.</p> <p>Already, I am planning to convert from my PSE methane fueled furnace and water heater at my own cost because there are currently no financial incentives for me to convert from methane to electricity because they are supplied by different utilities (electricity from Tacoma Power). I am an example of the many families demanding cleaner ways to heat our homes that reduce the future impact of climate change on our children.</p>

			<p>Thank you for consideration and urge you to REJECT PSE's massive proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Anna Markee</p>
	Kai	Email	<p>I oppose the proposed rate increase. The increase in my electricity bill will affect me personally.</p> <p>Please do not raise the rates.</p> <p>Kai, Bellingham</p>
	Evan Bridges	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Evan Bridges
	Tiffany MacBain	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Tiffany MacBain</p>
	Tim Kerfoot	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Tim Kerfoot</p>
	J.L. Evans	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>J.L. Evans</p>
	Elena Rumiantseva	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Elena Rumiantseva</p>



Mary Gershanoff	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mary Gershanoff</p>
Deborah Bevilaqua	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Deborah Bevilaqua</p>
	Sarah S Broomfield	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Sarah S Broomfield</p>
	Chris Dacus	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Chris Dacus</p>
	leonard rowantree	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas</p>

			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>leonard rowantree</p>
	Danne Neill	Email	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am contacting you to ask you not to raise electrical fees at this time. Raising the cost of electricity would most certainly hurt people who are already having a very difficult time paying their basic bills and putting food on the table for themselves and their families. Many people are struggling to recover from the Covid pandemic, loss of family members due to Covid, long Covid, inflation causing higher costs of everything including, food, gasoline, keeping a roof over their heads, utilities (such as water in Bellingham), clothing for work and school and other basics.</p> <p>I live on a street that is full of transients. They live in tents, RV's, cars and some just flop down on the ground. Many of the people I speak with are unhoused because of unfortunate situations and rising costs. Whatever money they have is not sufficient to pay their basic bills. As a result, they've found themselves on</p>

			<p>the street with no livelihood and very little future. Raising basic utility costs will likely cause more homelessness.</p> <p>Inflation is hurting many people. It is not a good time to add to their problems.</p> <p>Many states are legislating the removal of gas, propane, wood, oil and all other sources of heat, cooking, hot water generation and fuel for cars. It appears you will be the only source of energy available in the future. In order for this change to be accepted by the public it seems wise to leave the rates as they are for now.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p> <p>Danne Neill</p>
A J Hawkins	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. A J Hawkins
Jan Shimp	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jan Shimp	
Sue Morrison	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began	

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sue Morrison</p>
	Philip Crawford	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Philip Crawford</p>
	Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>



			Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt
	Mary Forman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mary Forman</p>
	Sammy Low	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sammy Low</p>
	Fred M. Rhoades	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>No to raising rates at this time. Why should people suffering the effects of 10% inflation pay stockholders of PSE dividends when the rate payers are not getting that kind of dividend on their savings (if they have any)? The shareholders are getting dividends about five times higher than the interest on the most generous bank accounts! This is a travesty!</p> <p>Fred M. Rhoades, Bellingham</p>
	Joann Terranova	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Joann Terranova</p>
	Tina Bixby	Email	<p>I strongly oppose this rate increase! PSE has asked for and been granted rate increases every year and we, as consumers, have not had a similar increase in our wages. In fact, the cost of living has skyrocketed for us over the last three years, while the interest rates on our bank accounts have plummeted to way below 1 percent. Why do the large corporations get to continue to profit at our expense?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Puget Sound Energy is requesting an increase in guaranteed profit from 9.4% to 9.9%. That means their shareholders are getting dividends about five times higher than the interest on the most generous bank accounts. Most of these shareholders are abroad.</li><li>• The average increase for residential service will be \$12/month in the first year, with further increases in years two and three. We cannot afford this kind of increase. It comes down to choosing between food, gasoline and electricity. This just isn't fair!</li></ul> <p>Please put a stop to this. Our Attorney General has opposed this increase and this regulatory board should join him and advocate for the people of Washington rather than big corporations.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tina Bixby</p>

	Mechtild Uhe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mechtild Uhe ena, Thuringia L4C 5T9</p>
	Cynthia Burgess	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Cynthia Burgess</p>
	Cleo Tabor	Email	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>PSE has had a number of rare increases over the last few years.</p> <p>I am against approving this rate increase package for PSE. Rates are already too high.</p> <p>Everytime the state government gives workers a pay increase every business put there raises their rates. We just cannot get ahead.</p> <p>Please disapprove PSEs request to gouge the consumer with another rate increase.</p> <p>Instead require that PSE and all energy companies to get higher rates from the other states that we send power and natural gas to. But stop gouging the residents of Washington.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my email.</p> <p>Cleo Tabor WA resident</p>

mjs.1987@gmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should never be rewarded for their constant bullying tactics we see all the time in corporations trying hard to buy the peoples trust through bribes and incentives.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Karen Phillips	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Karen Phillips</p>
	Robert Hunt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>What your doing by putting a Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal on unceded Native Land isnt just wrong. Its actually evil. Your putting money over community relationships, the environment, and the future of all of our children. I will not pay for your mistake. Not financially, ethically, and if we manage to stop you not environmentally either. I personally was at Standing Rock. I stand with the Puyallup Tribe against LNG. Your putting a litteral and environmental bomb in our backyard and I wont support that. How are you going to feel when it leaks or worse. How are you going to feel if some terrorist blows it up? How are you going to feel in the near future when your actions contribute to the end of coral reefs? When your actions create more dead zones in the ocean and more ghost forests? How are you going to explain to your grandchildren that you knew the risks and did this anyways?</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Robert Hunt</p>
	Mimi Stevens	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>



			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mimi Stevens</p>
	Vic Barlogio	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Vic Barlogio</p>
	Peda51	E-mail	<p>To the WUTC. I as a customer of PSE find these rate increases to be unjustified regarding the current reasons submitted to me by mail. To provide safe and reliable energy service should be the standard, and makes a</p>

			<p>great mission statement, for an electrical grid and or power company as no funds are generated when down. The 7,500 volt line that supply's my street has three separate breakers and all with in 75 yards of each other. I believe this line to be at least 75 years old. I understand what it means to be at the bottom of the pole, but I can't help but wonder were all that money was spent from that line over 75 years. The lineman just love resetting those when they pop loose. The state mandates decarbonization of energy systems. PSE meet's expectations of the customer and stakeholders by charging me an average of 15.80% increase in rates. I thought this public utility was regulated not deregulated. To allow for four years of capitol and operating investments made on behalf of customers not currently included in PSE rates, begs the question why has there not been any account of facts and financial figures submitted to justify any of the reasons given for this rate hike. Is PSE trying to recapture bad investments made for its operations or investments made on behalf of the customers? I can see higher operational costs if again you have honest facts and figures to justify them. I see nothing in that regard and increasing shareholders equity from 9.4% to 9.8% is ludicrous at this time due to the economy, world events, and pandemic.</p>
	Trevor Price	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Trevor Price
	Diane Falk	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Diane Falk</p>
	Sharon Schultz	E-mail	<p>I received a letter regarding the meeting 28 Sept 2022 on 27 Sept 2022. One day notice is insufficient to allow people to attend what will, I dare say, is a life changing event.</p> <p>Many senior citizens and other low-income households will need to choose between, heat, food, and/or gas to attend Dr. visits if this rate hike goes through. Why can't the shareholders or business owners get smaller dividends for one or two quarters? After all, they are the ones with the money to spare.</p> <p>With the raise in the gas tax, which will have more people voting Republican in November, people are struggling to get to work. If people can't get to work, they can't support their families, this no taxes to cover rate hikes in utilities.</p> <p>I don't know who decided more tax on gas was a great idea, especially when most of us can't afford to buy an electric car, but they will be hung out to dry by even moderate voters. When people can't afford to buy groceries they get very vindictive and sadly, this year especially, it will show in the ballot box.</p> <p>Please give the economy a year to stabilize before raising utilities on home owners.</p>

			<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sharon Schultz, Senior voter</p>
Susan Gillespie	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Doumit and Rendahl,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE), for their multi-year rate plan proposal.</p> <p>My husband Archie Levine &amp; I are against any PSE rate increase which addresses the costs of their LNG plant in Tacoma. This plant has been built for the benefit of for-profit companies' use and the investors who expect steady monetary returns, no matter what. It is also for the benefit of the high salaries for PSE executives and staff. Customers who are served by PSE, but who are not receiving these, or any other, benefits, are required to pay for all of the above. On the contrary, they have accumulated harm, both current and for the future if this plant is allowed to operate.</p> <p>According to WVC</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects.</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area.</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility has already generated, and will generate, large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, we urge you to deny passing on costs for the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Gillespie</p>
	Kari Hailey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kari Hailey</p>
	Nina Ozaki	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas

			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Nina Ozaki</p>
	Linda Cohan	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>



			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Linda Cohan</p>
Janice Gardner	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This</p>

			<p>assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Janice Gardner</p>
Cheryl Clingaman	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bullying tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women,</li><li>2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects</li><li>3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitats.</li></ol> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for the climate as other marine bunker fuels, when lifecycle emissions are counted.</p> <p>Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Cheryl Clingaman
	katherine finnigan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>katherine finnigan</p>
	Lori Stinson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lori Stinson</p>
	Kathleen Lowney	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Kathleen Lowney

James Anderson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>James Anderson</p>
Rachel Mann	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Rachel Mann</p>
	ayla pidal	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>

			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, ayla pidal</p>
	Peter Leighton	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate



			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Peter Leighton</p>
Benjamin Laub	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Benjamin Laub</p>
	tia.pearson@gmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Isaiah Bier	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). While reviewing PSE's request, it is important to remember that this company is also trying to develop the "Energize East Side" based on false data which they do not want to disclose, with the sole purpose of boosting their profits. This is a company which has little concern for their customers. We never had so many power outages in the past before PSE bought the previous power supplier. The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Isaiah Bier</p>
	Flora Wright	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Flora Wright</p>
	N N	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>N N</p>
	Carole Burger	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>It is my opinion that this project should be shut down and that the responsible parties should be held financially accountable for the expense of building it, not the Tacoma taxpayers.</p> <p>Thank you, Carole Burger</p>
	Elliott Bales	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>

			<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Elliott Bales esbales904@yahoo.com</p>
	Lawrence Anderson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>



			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Lawrence Anderson</p>
Barbara Church	E-mail	RE: PSE rate case docket UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>My name is Barb Church and I'm a NE Tacoma resident. I stand with the Puyallup Tribe in strongly opposing Puget Sound Energy's rate hike. This is a project I have been against since 2016.</p> <p>What's so upsetting to me is PSE's deceptive marketing. All over my Neighborhood Digest and it seems daily now, PSE is advertising a green energy future that will save customer's money. TV commercials are doing the same. In the background they have a flame. We all know that represents LNG "natural gas". Our clean energy future does not include fossil fuel.</p> <p>Currently, they're asking for a 17-20% rate increase. Most ratepayers don't even know it's to pay for 43% of the LNG refinery's construction costs. That amounts to \$133 million. \$133 million. They want the ratepayers to absorb that cost. They want our community to pay for a refinery that they don't support and don't think benefits them. Even in our coldest days last winter, we didn't need it.</p> <p>PSE should not be rewarded for the blatant disregard of their customers and the environment. They need to be held accountable for their history of poor engagement with the communities they serve...accountable for their misrepresentation of environmental concerns, accountable their lack of transparency, and accountable for their continued support for polluting energy sources.</p> <p>Thank you commissioners for all your work in holding PSE accountable, protecting ratepayers and listening to my concerns.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Barbara Church</p>
Esther Kronenberg	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	<p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Esther Kronenberg</p>
	Danielle Spitz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Danielle Spitz
	Karen Flood	E-mail	Last year one of my electric bills alone was \$700. I'm on Social Security and my monthly income is just over \$1000 a month. And yes I know I can get extra help to pay my electric bill but I'd really rather not be put in the position of having to do so. PSE is making enough profits and only pure greed is driving them to request this increase. It's time to side with consumers for a change and protect us from corporate profiteering when we are struggling to buy food. Shame on you if you grant this rate increase. Karen Flood Sent from my iPhone
	Rachel Wilson	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Rachel Wilson</p>
	Claudia Chalden	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Claudia Chalden</p>
	Ally Orosco	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>*the average person (which for many of us are hard-working, employed, blue-collar folk), should not be required to pay for new fossil fuel investments*</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>*this is illegal*</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>*this is disgusting on so many levels*</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

		<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>*if you can't do the right thing for the people, at least try and do the minimum thing and stop now*</p> <p>Ally Orosco</p>
	Madeleine Sosin	<p>Email</p> <p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Madeleine Sosin</p>
	Colleen Curtis	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Colleen Curtis</p>
	Roxy Murray Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad</p>

			<p>for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Roxy Murray</p>
	Vanassa Lundheim	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,      Vanessa Lundheim</p>
	Jeanne DeMund	E-mail	***See attached comment***
	Suzann Finch	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

			<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Suzann Finch</p>
Paul McMurray	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul McMurray</p>
	Elena Rumiantseva	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Elena Rumiantseva</p>
Lori Gudmundson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>



			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Lori Gudmundson</p>
	Jeanne C. DeMund	E-mail	<p>WUTC PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504</p> <p>PUBLIC COMMENT UE-220066 - "Threshold Prudence" re: Energize Eastside</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Document 220066-67-210918-Sett-Stip-Agmt-Rev-Req-8-26-22 page 9 of 46 Paragraph m. states,</p> <p>m. Energize Eastside. The Settling Parties agree that delayed service dates for Energize Eastside are assumed to be incorporated into the agreed upon revenue requirement above (i.e., South Phase in service by October 2023 and North Phase in service by October 2024). The Settling Parties agree that estimated costs associated with Energize Eastside (as described in PSE's</p>

initial filing) may enter rates provisionally (on the updated timeline, outlined above), subject to refund. Settling Parties accept and will not challenge that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to demonstrate that the investment should be provisionally included in rates. Settling Parties may challenge the costs of the project in the review of investments after the plant is placed in service.

My concern relates to "Threshold Prudence Requirement", which appears to be a newly invented step in the prudency determination process for transmission line projects.

What are the criteria for demonstrating the so-called "Threshold Prudence", and where can I find documentation of those criteria?

What exhibits in the record for Docket 220066 provide evidence documenting fulfillment of the criteria for "Threshold Prudence"?

Where is the rule making for the process relating to the so-called "Threshold Prudence" and where can I find documentation of the rules in the WAC or RCW?

If neither criteria nor rules relation to "Threshold Prudence" exist, how can PSE get agreement from Settlement Parties on its fulfillment?

Does the last minute invention of "Threshold Prudence" not attempt to circumvent the established Prudency criteria and standards, the WUTC Procedural Rules as specified in WAC 480-7, and possibly public participation, transparency and other provisions of the Revised Code of Washington?

Does the establishment of an invented "Threshold Prudence" with no criteria, rules, evidence/exhibits, public process, etc., not set up an unfair presumption of Prudency going forward once the Energize Eastside Project is finally completed?

In the absence of criteria, rules, evidence and public process regarding Threshold Prudence, I suggest that Paragraph m. must be removed from the Settlement Agreement.

In the absence of criteria, rules, evidence and public process regarding "Threshold Prudence", I believe that at a minimum, WUTC staff agreement to this provision of the Settlement Agreement should be set aside.

Thank you for considering my concerns about this issue.

			<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jeanne C. DeMund</p>
Laura Braunestahl	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny production of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>This is an ill-conceived project that does not benefit the citizens of this area and harms our environment.</p> <p>Thank you, Laura Braunestahl</p>
	Sharon Urban	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sharon Urban</p>
	Sandra Finley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , NO WISE CULTURE WOULD EVER HARM THE ENVIRONMENT.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Sandra Finley
Kathryn Lambros	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Kathryn Lambros</p>
	Cindy Kisska	E-mail	***See attachment - customer email too long for this filed***
	Kerry Mewhort	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad</p>

			<p>for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Yours truly, Kerry Mewhort</p>
	Laura Huddleston	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>



			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laura Huddleston</p>
wayland.hubbart@gmail.com	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	M.G. Bown-Orr	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          M.G. Bown-Orr</p>
	Ann Truyens		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Ann Truyens</p>
	Kristin Barber	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas</p>

		<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kristin Barber</p>
	Sandra John Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Sandra John</p>
	James Hendrickson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        James Hendrickson</p>
	Dannie Gillispie	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Dannie Gillispie</p>
	Sylvia Shriner	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,



			Sylvia Shriner
	Tyler Otto	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tyler Otto</p>
	Nancy McMahon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Nancy McMahan</p>
	Wendy Krahn	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas

			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Wendy Krahn</p>
	Ann Gaines	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ann Gaines</p>
	Laurette Culbert	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Laurette Culbert</p>
	Mark Houdashelt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mark Houdashelt</p>
	Brad Jones	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Brad Jones</p>
	Ra'id Khalil	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Ra'id Khalil</p>
	Dan Wheetman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Dan Wheetman</p>
	bdgholz@aol.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Becci Boyd	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Becci Boyd</p>

clv55@aol.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Steve Algieri	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is *not needed* to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Steve Algieri</p>
Lorraine Johnson	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Lorraine Johnson	
cxjesse@aol.com	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas	

			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	jimheadjr@hotmail.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Chris Rohwer	E-mail	<p>***See attachment for comment***</p> <p>I spoke at the Sep 28 meeting / hearing and would like to submit my written statement regarding the "requested changes to PSE rates", to which I am opposed.</p> <p>Please see attached PDF file for my statement of opposition which were requested to be submitted to the UTC by Oct 3, 2022.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Chris Rohwer</p>
	Chad Evans	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>



is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Chad Evans</p>
	Michael Maines	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Michael Maines</p>
	Paula Gordinier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Paula Gordinier</p>
	Greg Willett	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Greg Willett</p>
	Carol Bergesen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Carol Bergesen
Camille Brunel	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Camille Brunel</p>
Maria Mendes	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Maria Mendes</p>
Steven Hagerty	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Steven Hagerty</p>



	Joanne Gates	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Joanne Gates</p>
	Tika Bordelon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Tika Bordelon</p>
	Lisa Jefko	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lisa Jefko</p>
	Erik LaRue	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate</p>

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Erik LaRue</p>
	Kyle Lucas	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kyle Lucas</p>
	Gerd Schubert	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Gerd Schubert</p>
	Gloria Shen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Gloria Shen</p>
	Fred Greef	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Fred Greef</p>
	Diane McKenzie	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Diane McKenzie</p>
charlene47do novan	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>



			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Carol Kindt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Carol Kindt</p>
	Mike Pelly	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mike Pelly</p>
	Chelsea Vetter	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Chelsea Vetter</p>
	Mechelle Hannahs	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>

			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mechelle Hannahs</p>
	elyette weinstein	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          elyette weinstein</p>
	Leah Eister	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Leah Eister</p>
	Benjamin Courteau	Email	<p>As a PSE business &amp; residential customer in Langley, WA, I am very concerned about this potential rate increase. Not only will it harm many by increasing costs during uncertain times, but it will also help to fund fossil fuel energy infrastructure that we can no longer afford.</p> <p>If we are going to ensure that my 2 year old son and his kids have a healthy planet to live on, we need to</p>

			<p>reject rate increases now that will fund these kinds of destructive projects.</p> <p>Please reject the rate increase and any reimbursement of the LNG refinery and any other fossil fuel infrastructure.</p> <p>Benjamin Courteau Flying Bear Farm</p>
Amy McKay	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and</li></ul>

			<p>daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Amy McKay</p>
	Jim Miller	Email	<p>My comments are related to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE is asking for what amounts to close to 20% increase in the next 3 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. One of the reasons given by PSE for increasing our rates is to recover expenditures they made over the past 4 years. Why were these expenditures not planned for in previous rate increase requests? PSE states they decided to expend money up to 4 years ago and now want reimbursement. Does this mean they can make investments in the next 3 years and then come back and ask for a rate increase based on past for expenditures that would make this current request amount to more than a 20% increase? It would seem PSE needs to do better future planning and not burden rate payers with their poor decisions.</li><li>2. Another reason given by PSE for an increase in rates is to increase the owners equity to 9.9% from its current return on equity of 9.4% In my opinion, this is just being greedy at the expense of the rate payers. In this</li></ol>



			<p>day an age a return on investment of 9.4% is a pretty good one and I see no reason to increase that at this time.</p> <p>Can PSE assure the Commission that they will not in the future request rate increases for expenditures they decide to make during the 2023, 2024 and 2025 time frame their current request covers?</p> <p>Sincerely Jim Miller Puyallup, WA</p>
Sara A.	E-mail		<p>My name is Sara Airoidi, and I am a citizen of Bellingham, WA, USA.</p> <p>I'm writing to request all action be taken against the PSE rate increase. At this crucial time, we need all resources directed towards climate sustainability, and not extraction of money or that which continues to harm our ability to live on the planet.</p> <p>There are many solutions, and we need your leadership in the thoughtful considerations and actions to shift our trajectory for our shared future.</p> <p>Thank you, Sara</p>
Jan Ellis	E-mail		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jan Ellis</p>
	Michelle Collar	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Michelle Collar
	Desiree Douglass	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Desiree Douglass</p>
	Lynn Fitz-Hugh	E-mail	<p>Hello:</p> <p>I tried to come testify tonight – but the first 40 minutes were spent in late start and making people first type their names in the chat and then come on and spell their names....so I had to go long before you called my name. Every other public agency I testify has an online way to sign up so people are in order and no time is wasted on the sign ups. No where on your website could I find information about the hearing tonight or how to sign up. Please improve your process.</p> <p>Here are my public comments for the record:</p>

			<p>I am one of PSE’s many hostage customers. By which I mean they are the only electric company in Thurston county. If I want electricity I have no choice but to be their customer. I don’t have the choice of going to a company that manages their costs better or that is not destroying our environment. With such a monopoly it is incumbent that you in your role as regulators hold them accountable.</p> <p>It is outrageous that they ask for this rate hike. I have testified before you at least 3 other times all about PSE – asking you to stop their business plan that increases fossil fuel involvement at a time when we need to reduce not increase fossil fuel use, asking you to stop their outrageous sale for \$1 of their coal plant to a shell company to “comply” with the WA legislature while actually disobeying it, and asking you to stop them from building the LNG plant against the will of the Pullayup Tribe. AND NOW after they did all these bad business decisions...they want us to pay for those with a 19% rate hike while they continue to profit?!?!? No way. This again is where if they were a regular business I would take my business elsewhere.</p> <p>I also say to you – I want no part of that LNG plant. I want no part of the colonization of yet again operating against and over the rights of the tribe, and I want no part of a plant that can blow up and kill everyone in a 6 mile radius, and I want no part of a plant that has one of the strongest GHG’s that we have on the planet. So if absolutely everything about it morally offends me, and I have not been passive about my opposition – I have voiced it at every point I could....why then should I now have to pay for this monstrosity.</p> <p>Lynn Fitz-Hugh Faith Action Climate Team Coordinator</p>
	Richard Conoboy	E-mail	<p>I am opposed the proposed rate increase by PSE an utility that has made a profit for decades. PSE should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers. Furthermore, the increase in authorized Return on Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9% is not sustainable for PSE rate payers and is an exceedingly high guaranteed return.</p> <p>During this time of very high inflation, it is incumbent on everyone, PSE included, to stop actions that speak to profiteering</p> <p>I note that the Washington State Attorney General (AGO) has provided expert testimony to OPPOSE this rate increase. ( <a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista">https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista</a> ) AGO’s experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified, that is, PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent! Experts also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers, being approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates</p> <p>These increases will especially hit hard the most vulnerable of our citizens with an electricity cost increase of</p>

			\$10 to \$20 per month (expected residential increase).
	Carolyn Jackson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Carolyn Jackson</p>
	Anne Kroeker	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE), for their multi-year rate plan proposal.</p> <p>I, and my husband Richard Leeds, are against any PSE rate increase which addresses the costs of their LNG plant in Tacoma. This plant has been built for the benefit of for-profit companies' use and the investors who expect steady monetary returns, no matter what. It is also for the benefit of the high salaries for PSE executives and staff. Customers who are served by PSE, but who are not receiving these, or any other, benefits, are required to pay for all of the above. On the contrary, they have accumulated harm, both current</p>

		<p>and for the future if this plant is allowed to operate.</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects.</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area.</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility has already generated, and will generate, large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul>
--	--	---

			<p>To this end, we urge you to deny passing on costs for the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Anne Kroeker</p>
Vidette Buchman	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vidette Buchman</p>
	Gina Singh	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>



			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Gina Singh</p>
	Jordan Van Voast	E-mail	<p>Being that my name is at the end of the alphabet, I may not be able to stay. So here are my comments:</p> <p>Good evening, My name is Jordan Van Voast and I am a former PSE rate payer. Because of my racial and economic privilege, I was able to place 37 solar panels on my roof, install a heat pump and an electric induction cooktop and subsequently instruct PSE to cut their gas line at the street in order to minimize the inherent fire danger from gas explosions. As Hurricane Ian is tragically demonstrating right now, we are in a climate emergency and decision makers like the members of this Commission are the ones who will determine whether we have a sustainable future, or allow business as usual decision making to push our world past greenhouse gas tipping points that is already affecting the most vulnerable communities. Rewarding PSE with permission to increase rates sends the wrong message. Huge infrastructure projects like the Tacoma LNG facility are steeped in environmental racism impacting the Puyallup Tribe and disaster capitalism that rewards a few people at the top while ultimately penalizing all life for future generations. Thank you.</p>
	Jason Smith	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jason Smith</p>
	Julie Stone	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Julie Stone
Jessica Johnson	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jessica Johnson	
Alice Cryer	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.	

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Alice Cryer</p>
	Diane Dakin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Diane Dakin

	Nina Cox	E-mail	i does seem that the utilities take every opportunity to raise rates, that is very hard on older folks on a fixed income.
	Mary Kern	E-mail	*** See Attachment***
	Krista and Pete Perkins	E-mail	<p>I am writing a comment regarding the PSE proposed rate hikes for both Electric and Gas. These rate hikes are unacceptable: in three years electric would increase by 19.62% and gas hike of 16.10%. While we understand that rates may be increasing, the amount is unacceptable.</p> <p>Especially the rates that are proposed for 2023 - for 15.80% electric and 12.15% gas!</p> <p>These rate hikes should be not allowed beyond 10% increase and even then that is very high.</p> <p>In addition, the reason to "increase PSE authorized return on equity from 9.4 to 9.9" should be eliminated.</p> <p>This household is opposed to the extreme rate increase request and hopes that the UTC will only accept a much smaller increase.</p> <p>Krista and Pete Perkins</p>
	Todd Lagestee	E-mail	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I would like to provide written comments about the proposed PSE rate increase for 2023, in case I am not able to testify tonight on zoom.</p> <p>I am absolutely opposed to this rate increase. PSE is engaging in a form of corporate gouging to seek to increase its Return On Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9%. That is not realistic given the impacts of the inflationary environment that the citizens of Washington State are experiencing today.</p> <p>Further, a government sanctioned monopoly should not be authorized an excessively high rate of return with one of the safest investments there is, utilities.</p> <p>I was a nuclear operator on submarines, so I know a little about power generation. I also have served over 20 years as a professional firefighter. I know how people are struggling, because I see them in their homes. I understand the industry more than the average citizen. I can honestly say that I believe the UTC has the obligation to act to lower PSE's ROE. Further, the obligation to pay for the CETA should not be externalized onto PSE rate payers. It should come out of the profits of PSE.</p>

			<p>Thanks for considering,</p> <p>Todd Lagestee</p>
	Colleen Haight	E-mail	<p>I am writing to express my concern and objection to a 10-15% rate increase. As a disabled senior with an adult disabled child, we cannot keep pace with all of the rising costs surrounding every inch of our lives at present. I know we're not alone. We spent a very cold winter at home last year and still had high electric bills. I don't see how an increase this high is justifiable or moral. Thank you.</p> <p>Colleen Haight          Bellingham, WA</p>
	Russ Gibson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Russ Gibson</p>
	Lynn Fitz-Hugh	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas</p>

		<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lynn Fitz-Hugh</p>	
	Binh Nguyen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to</p>



			<p>the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Binh Nguyen</p>
Cat Sundin	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Cat Sundin</p>
	<p>Tanisha Roberts</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.          Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.          PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.          Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.          Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.          Tanisha Roberts</p>
	<p>Kathryn Wilham</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathryn Wilham</p>
	Chris Pritchard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This</p>

			<p>assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Chris Pritchard</p>
	<p>ANNA          WILBANKS</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>ANNA WILBANKS</p>
	<p>Michael          Blome</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Michael Blome</p>
	Elizabeth Burton Ph.D.	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I urge you to oppose rate increase requested by PSE.</p> <p>Apparently, PSE says the rate increase is necessary to help pay for its ill-conceived and unpermitted LNG plant in Tacoma. I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that this plant subjects Tacoma residents to extreme public safety risks, and should never have been built. The following is from Compendium of Scientific, Medical, and Media Findings Demonstrating Risks and Harms of Fracking and Associated Gas and Oil Infrastructure (Eighth Edition), April 2022, by Concerned Health Professionals of New York and Physicians for Social Responsibility.</p> <p>LNG creates acute public safety risks. LNG explodes when spilled into water and, if spilled on the ground, can turn into rapidly expanding, odorless clouds that can flash-freeze human flesh and asphyxiate by displacing oxygen. If ignited at the source, LNG vapors can become flaming "pool fires" that burn hotter than other fuels and cannot be extinguished. LNG fires burn hot enough to cause second-degree burns on exposed skin up to a mile away. LNG facilities pose significant risks to nearby population centers and have been identified as potential terrorist targets.</p> <p>In addition to these extreme public safety risks, LNG will add to the climate crisis. As a marine fuel, it is no better for the climate than conventional oil-based fuels, because of the methane that leaks at every stage of its extraction, transportation, storage, and use. These methane leaks are a feature, not a bug; they cannot be eliminated, since methane needs to be flared to keep pressure from building up and causing an explosion. And both the International Maritime Organization and the World Bank consider using LNG as a marine fuel to be a hinderance and a delay in ships moving to true zero-emission fuels.</p> <p>Please deny this rate increase request.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>

			Elizabeth Burton, Ph.D.
	Linda Wasserman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Linda Wasserman</p>
	Christy Turnbow	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Christy Turnbow</p>
	Elizabeth Mitchell	E-mail	<p>To the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>I'm a PSE residential customer writing to express my fervent opposition to proposed PSE rate increases.</p> <p>PSE claims that this rate increase will allow them to increase reliability of service and meet clean energy goals, but their reliability hasn't improved in 10 years, and they have only increased their reliance on dirty energy sources in the past 2 decades.</p> <p>Another PSE argument is that they need to recover costs for capital and operating investments, like Energize Eastside. But they have NEVER demonstrated the need for this project nor have they even finished planning and permitting it. They have not provided data on Eastside electricity consumption nor responded to arguments that batteries, demand response, and other measures could meet our needs on the Eastside and meet the state's clean energy goals without cutting down our trees, disrupting our safety and quality of life, and spending huge amounts of money.</p> <p>Adding insult to injury as they cut down trees in Renton and South Bellevue, they have now decided to charge residential ratepayers for Energize Eastside ahead of time, despite the fact that the costs are unknown and the project isn't even permitted in some places, like North Bellevue where I live. Why should we ratepayers have to pay for this project at all, let alone suffer a 20 PERCENT increase in electrical rates before even the project plans are complete, let alone the project itself?</p> <p>I believe the answer still is that PSE's top priority is making money for their foreign shareholders, with no concern for their customers or the wellbeing of our community, our state, and our planet. These rate increases</p>



			are not "fair, just and reasonable," as required by the state.
	Andrelene Babbitt	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Andrelene Babbitt</p>
	Margie Bone	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          As a PSE customer, I am appalled by this proposed rate increase. We customers have watched as PSE has ridden roughshod over customers, including the tribe, in building an expensive LNG terminal in an earthquake zone. Clearly not for us. I'm tired of paying for outsized profits for shareholders while our needs and preferences are ignored.</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many</p>

			<p>customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Margie Bone</p>
	Kyle Lucas	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kyle Lucas</p>
	Greg Saul	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Greg Saul</p>
	SUSAN KILGORE	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating</p>

			<p>inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>SUSAN KILGORE</p>
	Taen scherer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Taen scherer</p>
	Cynthia Fleener	Email	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Cynthia Fleener</p>
	Lory French	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>



			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lory French</p>
	Loewyn Young	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Loewyn Young</p>
	Christine Wells	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility</li></ul>

will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,

			Christine Wells
	Margo Rolf	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Margo Rolf</p>
	Cherisa McCoy	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Cherisa McCoy</p>
Keith Harty	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Keith Harty	

	Karen Nolan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Emily Geballe	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>



			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Emily Geballe</p>
	Denise Farrer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Denise Farrer</p>
David Bluhm	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose any and all rate increases proposed and/or requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE), a foreign owned corporation, for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should never come before basic human needs and the goal of maintaining reasonable utility rates for the people and families of Washington. Those same families that have consistently paid their rates, allowing PSE to grow and be sold from foreign corporation to foreign corporation at high profit margins while continually generating high profit margins for the new "owners". Why in the world was a United States public utility company ever allowed to be sold to a foreign corporation or taken out of the public domain at all? Recent history has proven that continued rate increases have not increased reliability nor quality of service for PSE residential customers. The only thing those rate increases have allowed are ongoing record profit levels for PSE and its foreign owned parent companies. It is past time to put a stop to this sell out now. PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past and some currently being built, as well as unspecified, incomplete projects. Recent past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment and efforts to move rapidly to cleaner, greener, truly sustainable energy sources. LNG is NOT a clean, green,, sustainable nor environmentally beneficial or neutral energy source. Just because a product has the word "natural" in its name does not mean it is not harmful to the environment. Puget Sound Energy continues to greenwash the facts by not providing "all" the information that would allow truly informed understanding and decision making by city, county and state officials and voters. The people and families of Washington should not have to pay increased rates for infrastructure that they will likely never use or be allowed to use only a small percentage thereof. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency,</p>

			<p>and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs.</p> <p>This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission needs to deny any and all reimbursement, tax incentives, and/or rate increases for this and other "false climate solution" and greenwashed energy production, processing and/or storage facilities.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown, Indigenous and low-income households. Please deny these rate increases accordingly and appropriately.</p> <p>David Bluhm</p>
	William Jacques	E-mail	<p>These are my comments on the requested changes to electric and natural gas rates on Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>I believe the rate increases proposed are excessive and downright demeaning. The cost of electricity and natural gas has not increased nearly as much as the proposed rate increases, and the company is making an exorbitant amount of profit as demonstrated by the extravagant salaries of executives (and probably employees). They need to get their house in order and bring down internal costs instead of sticking it to their customers. They essentially have a monopoly on energy in this area and that is why a private foreign company bought PSE in the first place. Those of us who are on fixed incomes do not have a choice of using less and less energy to survive and the UTC has as an obligation to deny approval of such an exorbitant rate increase. See below the windfall salaries of executives on the back of us common people. There are many more managers who make an exorbitant salary who many not even be needed. What ever happened to lean management? We just cannot afford these big increases.</p> <p>As President and Chief Executive Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Mary E. Kipp made \$2,942,831 in total compensation in 2019, \$5,296,566 in 2020, and \$4,414,245 in 2021 with a pay ratio of 34:1.</p> <p>As Former Senior Vice President Chief Financial Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Daniel A. Doyle made \$2,193,609 in total compensation in 2019, \$1,909,022 in 2020, and \$1,286,597 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Kazi Hasan made \$1,116,080 in total compensation in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President, Chief Operations Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Booga K. Gilbertson made \$1,333,686 in total compensation in 2020, and \$1,122,110 in 2021.</p>

			<p>As Senior Vice President Shared Services and CIO at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Margaret F. Hopkins made \$845,652 in total compensation in 2020, and \$819,748 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President, General Counsel, Chief Ethics &amp; Compliance Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Steve R. Secrist made \$1,636,062 in total compensation in 2020, and \$1,374,934 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President Regulatory and Strategy at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Adrian J. Rodriguez made \$1,316,682 in total compensation in 2021.</p> <p>Thank you for your support in this matter, William Jacques</p>
Colin Johnson	E-mail		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Colin Johnson
Julie Goebel	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>

			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Joe Wiederhold	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p>

			<p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.          Joe Wiederhold</p>
	Ki Bre	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Ki Bre</p>
	Nathan Stix	E-mail	<p>Why should rate payers begin rewarding PSE with a 9.8% rate of return on an infrastructure investment whose total cost is still unknown, whose need has not been verified and that would cost ratepayers close to \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of the project. I say NO!          Nathan Stix</p>



			PSE Newcastle Customer
	Mark Joy	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Mark Joy</p>
Jacob Bailey	E-mail		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jacob Bailey</p>
	Thomas Swoffer	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Thomas Swoffer</p>
	Garrett Tatsumi	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers.</li><li>2. Has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe.</li><li>3. Has unacceptable environmental justice impacts.</li><li>4. Is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions.</li><li>5. Sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects.</li></ol> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.
	Cindy Kisska	E-mail	***See attachment - comment too long for text field***
	Meg casey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li> <li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li> </ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	David Gralenski	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

			<p>facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Nancy Shimeall	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for providing oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that



this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Shimeall</p>
	Lisa Barton	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>It is of utmost importance that reimbursement of LNG refinery and any other fossil fuel infrastructure be rejected.</p> <p>Don't allow PSE rate increase!</p> <p>Think about the future of the earth and humanity!</p> <p>Thank you for listening!</p> <p>-Lisa (mother of 4, Edmonds resident)</p> <p>Lisa Barton</p>
	Robert S. Briggs	E-mail	<p>***See attachment for comment***</p> <p>Please find attached my public comment on Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Robert S. Briggs</p>

	Juliette Karmel	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Juliette Karmel</p>
	Solomon Karmel	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Solomon Karmel</p>
	Jeanette Mihaila	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jeanette Mihaila</p>
	Joy Dang	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Joy Dang
Paul Karmel	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the</li></ul>



			<p>next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Karmel</p>
	Martine Smets	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will</li></ul>

barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Martine Smets

alicensyberland	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Karen & John Morris	E-mail	<p>I am referencing Dockets UE-220066 (electric service) and UG-220067 (natural gas service). I have read through the material PSE sent with my bill.</p> <p>I strongly disagree that PSE should be allowed these increases at this time. Of the 6 bullet points of "reasons" for the "rate adjustments", I find only one that might have any merit, to recover increased operating costs. There is no info however about what those increased costs are, or why they need so much of an increase to continue to provide safe and reliable energy service. Many of the reasons are vague and have no supporting info. I have to question who the "stakeholders" are whose expectations they seem to be more worried about than their financially overburdened customers. We, (especially those of us on fixed incomes) are already struggling with rising overall inflation for everything we need , and about 20% loss (so far) in our retirement accounts. This is not the time to raise rates almost 20% on electric and over 16% on natural gas</p>

			<p>(using overall average increase for residential customers over 3 years cited in their materials) .</p> <p>I feel especially strongly about the last reason, to increase PSE's authorized return on equity. This is absolutely no time for them to increase their return, when many of their customers are struggling with significant decreases in return, and continuing increases in costs for essentials. They need to soldier through like the rest of us. Please deny these increases.</p> <p>I am also sending this comment to the email PSE gave on their info brochure about this, even though it shows up as "no results found" when I entered it. Coincidental?</p> <p>Karen &amp; John Morris</p>
ellen kildaw	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. ellen kildaw
	Teresa Farris	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Teresa Farris</p>
	Janet Bautista	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>DO NOT FORCE LNG ON US. It’s a waste of time and money that could be used for renewable energy sources and research.</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Janet Bautista</p>
	Madison Severson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Hello, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>

			<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Madison Severson Madison Severson mseverson127@gmail.com</p>
	Isabella LeVey	E-mail	<p>Both me, a disabled woman on Ssi and my family would like to go on the record that we do not support the price increase. I cannot afford it on my limited income. I am all for green energy but not at the cost of people's safety.</p> <p>Isabella LaVey</p>
	Dorothy Wayne	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Dorothy Wayne</p>
	Virginia Lohr	E-mail	***See attachment for comments***
	Abram R. Jacobson	E-mail	<p>Here is my comment for Docket UE-220066.</p> <p>I am a 74-year old retiree on a pension. I already pay staggeringly high utility bills. This is something I do willingly and without complaining, as long as each utility is willing to share in some of the economic pain that most Washingtonians, myself included, are currently feeling.</p> <p>But now, along comes PSE, greedily demanding 9.9% guaranteed profit rather than a “mere” 9.4%. To avoid any discomfort falling onto their wealthy overseas investors.</p> <p>This would be funny were it not so sad and despicable. The economically privileged wealthy investors in PSE, be they in Copenhagen, Qatar, Riyaad, or New York City, expect to let the “little people”, the ratepayers, insulate the priveleged from the economy’s down cycle.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the UTC will reject this brazen attempt by PSE to profit off their ratepayers’ economic misery. You on the UTC must protect the Washington public from this outrageous rip-off.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Abram R. Jacobson</p>
	Jonathan Pottle	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>



			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jonathan Pottle</p>
	cheryl diamond	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>cheryl diamond</p>
Glen Anderson	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I am appalled that PSE wants to make CUSTOMERS pay for their CLIMATE-KILLING LNG plant in Tacoma, which also hurts the Puyallup Tribe!!!! I IMPLORE YOU TO DENY the rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs. Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities. PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment. Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility. Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.	

			Glen Anderson
	Andronetta Douglass	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has made a profit for decades and should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers. People are struggling due to inflation.</li> <li>• PSE is requesting an increase in authorized Return on Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9%. This is not sustainable for their rate payers and is an exceedingly high guaranteed return.</li> <li>• During this time of exceedingly high inflation, it is incumbent on government agencies to reign in increased profiteering by corporations.</li> <li>• The Washington State Attorney General (AGO) has provided expert testimony to OPPOSE this rate increase. ( <a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista">https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista</a> )       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o AGO’s experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified. PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent</li> <li>o The experts also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers, being approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An electricity cost increase of \$10 to \$20 per month will stress working class people in Bellingham and Whatcom county. We already have a tremendous number of citizens who have become homeless due to the high cost of living and low wages. Please decrease the financial rewards to your top executives. They are making too much and the rest of us make too little.</li> </ul>
	Meryle A. Korn	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following</p>

			<p>additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Meryle A. Korn</p>
	Justine Eister	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.        PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.        This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.        We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Justine Eister</p>
	Janice Wilfing	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and</p>

			<p>lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Janice Wilfing</p>
	Eldon H Graham	Email	<p>I have just learned of this rate case and am not sure that many of my 350+ neighbors who are members of the Sunset Community Association in south east Bellevue are aware of PSE’s rate request.</p> <p>I am absolutely opposed to any rate increase that would be used to fund PSE’s Energize Eastside Project. I have been following Energize Eastside for several years and have not heard of any compelling evidence that the project is required.</p> <p>I am a graduate electrical engineer, have worked (engineering, revenue requirements &amp; legal) for an entity that was regulated by the WUTC, follow events in the field and believe PSE is following an old energy playbook.</p> <p>If PSE is convinced that future electric demand justifies the Project then let revenue from that future demand pay for its expenses and capital costs to serve that demand. There is no credible reason why we existing rate payers should bear the burden before the imagined demand materializes.</p> <p>Eldon H Graham</p>

			BSEE Oregon State University
	Steve Rubicz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Steve Rubicz</p>
	Mary Rowe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.          The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p>

			<p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Mary Rowe</p>
	Rein Attemann	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Rein Attemann</p>
	Evelyn Dial	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential</p>



			<p>customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Evelyn Dial</p>
	Samantha Hughes Lutge Samantha Hughes Lutge	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>First, the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, is used for Maritime purposes and not for homes. The public should not experience a tax hike due to any of the operations or expenses of this plant.</p> <p>Second, PSE prioritizes investments in fracked "natural" gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing more in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE's decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a main focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the "lowest cost". When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet</p>

			<p>should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Samantha Hughes Lutge</p>
	Sherry Hill	Email	<p>I am quite surprised and shocked that PSE is asking for an overall 13.59 percent increase in electricity rates for 2023. I would also add the similar increase in gas rates although I do not have natural gas.</p> <p>This significant increase is going to affect a lot of people in this monopoly of service and should be highly scrutinized for its significance. Each year I look at the proposals in passing as it is usually of a small percentage increase. But this amount could impact many subscribers.</p> <p>Is this increase truly appropriate and necessary? Please scrutinize this proposed increase and hopefully it will be less than is what is proposed.</p> <p>thank you, Sherry Hill</p>
	Hugo Cruz-Moro	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more</p>

		<p>methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Hugo Cruz-Moro</p>
Diana Sharon	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p>

			Diana Sharon
Abbie Abramovich	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Abbie Abramovich</p>
	Matthew Boguske	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. The frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as a shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the</p>

			<p>construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission needs to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown, and Indigenous families, and low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Matthew Boguske</p>
	JP Kemmick	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>JP Kemmick</p>
	Bonnie Swift	Email	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope, largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, as well as projects currently being built, and unspecified projects to be completed in the next three years. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility.</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court.</p>

		<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that Liquefied Natural Gas is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Even if LNG was cleaner, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be borne by residential customers.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating, and both state and local government regulations moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>PSE wishes to charge customers hundreds of millions of dollars for the Energize Eastside transmission upgrade project, which is not complete, has not obtained land use permits to proceed with half the project, and relies on overstated demand projections.</p> <p>PSE seeks millions of dollars to recover project costs of Lake Hills Transmission Line, even though the project was strongly opposed by the community it was intended to serve and their elected representatives. The community also raised thousands of dollars to study alternative solutions but PSE refused to engage.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs related to fracking: poisoned water tables; earthquakes; destruction of habitat; violations of Indigenous sovereignty, increase in the epidemic of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Bonnie</p>
--	--	---

	Jeanne Kinley Deller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jeanne Kinley Deller</p>
	William Biederman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs. Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities. PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment. Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility</p>



			<p>will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>William Biederman</p>
	<p>Fern Dot</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Hello,</p> <p>I am writing in as a current PSE customer and concerned community member.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and</p>

			energy efficiency are available instead. Fern Dot
	Shaina Kilpatrick	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Shaina Kilpatrick</p>
	Sally Neary	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sally Neary</p>
Rachael Crowther	Email		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Rachael Crowther</p>
	Tika Bordelon	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.
	Denise Henrikson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.          Denise Henrikson</p>
	Virginia Lohr	E-mail	*** See Attached Comment***
	Lilia Bickson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          Work is being conducted without proper permits, and now Puget Sound Energy has the gall to increase rates on already struggling customers.          We are watching colonialism happening right before our eyes, rewarding these companies for violating the lands of their own people is wrong. The Tacoma Human Rights commission, WA's Clean Energy Coalition, the Attorney General's office, and the people recognize Puget Sound Energy's fundamental flaws. Will the Utilities and Transportation commission?          Lilia Bickson</p>

	Abe Jacobson	E-mail	<p>Here is my comment for Docket UE-220066.</p> <p>I am a 74-year old retiree on a pension. I already pay staggeringly high utility bills. This is something I do willingly and without complaining, as long as each utility is willing to share in some of the economic pain that most Washingtonians, myself included, are currently feeling.</p> <p>But now, along comes PSE, greedily demanding 9.9% guaranteed profit rather than a “mere” 9.4%. To avoid any discomfort falling onto their wealthy overseas investors.</p> <p>This would be funny were it not so sad and despicable. The economically privileged wealthy investors in PSE, be they in Copenhagen, Qatar, Riyaad, or New York City, expect to let the “little people”, the ratepayers, insulate the priveleged from the economy’s down cycle.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the UTC will reject this brazen attempt by PSE to profit off their ratepayers’ economic misery. You on the UTC must protect the Washington public from this outrageous rip-off.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hannah Lima	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>



			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Hannah Lima</p>
sidonie wittman	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>sidonie wittman</p>
Sage Ahrens-Nichols	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Melissa Coolick	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility</p>

			<p>will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Melissa Coolick</p>
Jonathan Pottle	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Jess Taluth	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Charlotte Linton		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this</p>

			<p>corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Charlotte Linton</p>
	Jessica Moe	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Kat Barlow	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Barbara Stevenson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Barbara Stevenson</p>
	Morris Williams	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Diane Shaughnessy	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>



			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Diane Shaughnessy</p>
	Cindy Mystt	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>

			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	April Smith	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p>

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>April Smith</p>
	Janet McKinney	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>I oppose the suggested rate increase by PSE for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) PSE has made a profit for decades and should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers.</li><li>2) PSE is requesting an increase in authorized Return on Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9%. This is not sustainable for their rate payers and is an exceedingly high guaranteed return.</li><li>3) During this time of exceedingly high inflation, it is incumbent on government agencies to reign in increased profiteering by corporations.</li><li>4) The Washington State Attorney General (AGO) has provided expert testimony to OPPOSE this rate increase. (<a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista">https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista</a>)<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. AGO’s experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified. PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent.</li></ol></li><li>5) The experts also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers, being approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates.</li><li>6) I will be highly affected by the electricity cost increase of \$10 to \$20 per month because that is more money than people think for a person on a fixed budget. If I must pay \$10 more a month that means something basic will be eliminated.</li></ol>

	Madeline Burns	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Madeline Burns</p>
	Casey McManus	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Good Morning, The citizens of Tacoma and Pierce County should not be responsible for the energy bill that the largest and most unsustainable corporations are creating. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Barbara Hughes</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>I would like to voice my objection to Puget Sound Energy's request for a 20% rate increase.</p> <p>I live in the affected area, and object to PSE seeking this 20% increase to fund Energize Eastside when the Energize Eastside permit hearing date for the North Bellevue project segment is not even yet announced. This is like putting the 'cart before the horse' when the full facts around any need for an increase and the total project costs are not yet known. In fact, the project may not even go ahead.</p> <p>Further, I object on the grounds that this is a time of financial struggle for many of my neighbors. Huge increases in the cost of necessary expenses such as rent and food mean that PSE's proposal will hit hardest those least able to afford it. It is inequitable.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore both unjustifiable (project not yet approved) and inequitable (will affect the poorest hardest) and on these grounds I respectfully ask you to DENY PSE's request for this rate increase.</p> <p>Barbara Hughes</p>
	<p>Janet Higbee-Robinson</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Janet Higbee-Robinson</p>
Christy Scerra	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Carlo Voli	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Laura Zerr	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>



			<p>facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Ryan Moore	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Alyssa Urish	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

	Janet McKinney	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	TL Leever	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
Barbara Bonfield	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation. The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations. When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead. Barbara Bonfield	
Alyssa Urish	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized	

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Alison Fujino	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> </ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Alison Fujino</p>
	Jane Doe	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas



			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Karriann Rizzieri	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			<p>Thank you, Karriann Rizzieri</p>
Heather Nicholson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Patricia Grossie-Walton	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Morgan Brownlee	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Morgan Brownlee</p>
Breck Lebegue	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside.</p> <p>PSE must dis-invest in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should invest in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>We must stop exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>As a public health physicians, I know we must stop using fracked gas that causes cancer and birth defects, poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running</p>

			<p>beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p><b>JUST STOP IT!</b></p> <p>Breck Lebegue</p>
Christine KOhnert	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). Do not force us to pay for a project that is bad for our own health and survival, and bad for our ecosystem. We have alternatives that are less destructive.</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	m'lou christ	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts,</p>



			<p>worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>m'lou christ</p>
Claire Waltman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>	

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Claire Waltman</p>
	Lori Elworth	E-mail	<p>Attn: Hearing Examiner,</p> <p>My primary concern is the regulation of PSE and the neglect to include a project as large as Energize Eastside in the IRP. The WAC states this as a requirement. I attended several IRP meetings. The IRP technical advisors requested this be discussed many times. PSE repeatedly used excuses and continued to postpone any discussion concerning Energize Eastside. The UTC should deny any rate increase or reimbursement based on disregard to complete failure of independent review. They need to be held accountable.</p>

Energize Eastside has been a project I have followed since 2013. My concerns are safety. The Olympus neighborhood, where I have lived since 1988, is the owner of the property where both PSE and OPL have easements. The width of PSE's easement is only 100'. A safe width should be 120'-150' for 230kV power-lines. I would expect a safe width for power-lines sharing a corridor with two jet petroleum pipelines would need to be even wider.

Currently this narrow corridor shared by the two utilities has power-lines at a relatively low voltage supported by wooden poles. These wooden poles are located according to the easement granted; the center of the structure not more than 25' from the centerline of the easement. This places each structure at either side of the 50' pipeline easement. Although this is not ideal by modern standards, it is not particularly dangerous. The wooden poles are not conductive.

PSE has designed a project that is not safe or reliable. Introducing taller conductive metal poles increases danger of lightning strikes and arching. The easement width is already too narrow. Moving structures closer to pipelines means a greater risk of fatal damage to the pipelines should an arc occur. Increasing the voltage to 230kV (almost four times greater) means more energy with less room to dissipate. The taller poles and heavier wires also pose additional risks to the surrounding homes and properties.

PSE is creating an extremely unreliable situation. If the new high-voltage lines were to cause a pipeline failure due to the collocation, an explosion would create a single point of failure. If one 230kV circuit is out the other 230kV circuit must be taken out, an N-1 is automatically N-2 and incidentally not properly studied in EIS. The power outage will be for a significant amount of time after a pipeline rupture until it can be repaired. This is a dangerous design flaw creating a less reliable electric system. I would consider this a National Safety Risk. PSE is a foreign owned company and both the electric grid and the jet fuel pipelines could be compromised or targeted by terrorists. Safe and reliable power is at risk.

The Bellingham pipeline explosion resulted in 3 deaths. It could have been much worse if an explosion occurred within the narrow, shared easement where the corridor is densely populated in Newcastle. The less than 2 miles length of Newcastle's segment would be catastrophic.

We are basically not looking at safe reliable power. The reliability limitations really should be evaluated. This is a project with a host of significant unmitigated consequences, therefore I respectfully ask Energize Eastside reimbursement be denied. Please respect citizens concerns about safety, reliability, and aesthetics. Energize Eastside is unacceptable when the data is not verifiable. This project should've been reviewed by EFSEC. Purposely failing to discuss Energize Eastside as part of the IRP is negligent and irresponsible. Please listen to the rate payers concerns and protect them from unnecessary harm financial and otherwise.

	Bill Phipps	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Bill Phipps</p>
	Sherette Main	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Sherette Main</p>
	<p>Anna Pedersen</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Nakane Fernandez</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. We don't want gas! We want electrification! Y'all already declared a climate emergency. Act like it!</p> <p>Nakanee Fernandez</p>
	GN Connors	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Daniel Raphael	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Erica Ambis	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>



			<p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Erica Ambis</p>
	Cindy Kisska	E-mail	<p>I emailed a short comment and sent it to comments@utc.wa.gov on Thurs. Sept. 22, 2022 12:42 PM. Please replace it with this one I am sending in now, as this one is much longer and has many more detailed important facts. Thank you.</p> <p>My name is Cindy Kisska. I have been a Puget Sound Energy electric customer for 18 years. Every year PSE raises our rates. Every year the UTC holds a phone conference for one hour when we can call in. And every year the UTC ignores the public outcry to NOT give PSE permission to raise our rates AGAIN. Every year our complaints fall on deaf ears. We have one hour a year to speak our peace, and what happens? Nothing. It is business as usual. EVERY SINGLE YEAR PSE is allowed to RAISE OUR RATES.</p> <p>The UTC treats PSE as if it is two separate companies – one that services its shareholders, and one that services its customers. The company is ONE company, NOT two.</p> <p>Lets examine the facts: Truth is facts. What are the PSE’s facts? Simply put, PSE takes in Billions of</p>

dollars every year and gives away Millions of dollars in profits to its shareholders and CEOs every year, while STILL being allowed to raise our electric rates every single year.

The profits PSE makes, should be funneled down to its customers FIRST to lower our electric rates, NOT funneled upward FIRST TO PAY their ALREADY wealthy shareholders. The UTC's first and most important priority and concern is to protect the customers FIRST, because we are the one's struggling to pay our ever rising PSE bills, while still being able to afford to put food on our tables. These are OUR FACTS.

There are several programs, such as "LIHEAP" and the "H.E.L.P." program in place to financially help low-income customers pay their electric PSE bills. BUT Puget Sound Energy, the Utilities and Transportation Commission, and the Attorney General's Office, should NOT rest easy thinking that they have the poor people's backs covered, when so many PSE customers don't qualify for these programs BECAUSE THEIR INCOME IS JUST A FEW DOLLARS ABOVE THE CUT-OFF TO QUALIFY. KNOW FOR A FACT, there are 1000's and 1000's of families in the state of Washington, including children and the elderly, who are still suffering day and night in their cold houses and apartments because they cannot afford to turn their thermostats up any more than they already are. Tell this to PSE's already wealthy CEOs and Shareholders.

THE QUESTION REMAINS: WHY is PSE given the OKAY EVERY YEAR by the UTC TO GET AWAY WITH RAISING OUR RATES under the following BLARRING FACTS:

- 1) PSE paid almost \$40 million dollars to their top 5 Executive Employees over a 3 year period (2016, 2017, 2018) in salaries, incentives, compensations and bonuses. That was 4 years ago. It is now 2022. You can be sure the amount has gone up.
- 2) PSE took in \$3.4 Billion Dollars in 2019 and paid out \$64.2 million to their shareholders to pay for 5 foreign country's pension funds.
- 3) PSE belongs to a group called "Investor-Owned Utilities" ("IOUs") that service electric and gas customers across the state of WA. "They are all monopoly franchises" and "THEY EXIST to make a PROFIT FOR THEIR SHAREHOLDERS." PSE is a utility company, NOT a Fortune 500 Company.
- 4) These Investor-Owned Utilities, including PSE, paid out a total of ALMOST \$400 MILLION DOLLARS - \$395.3 Million Dollars to be exact - in DIVIDENDS in 2019.
- 5) PSE has become a "Profit-Churning Machine." They have become top heavy, with way too much money floating around at the top. WHY HAVE PSE's PROFITS NEVER "trickled down" TO TRANSLATE INTO SAVINGS FOR PSE's Electric Customers to LOWER OUR RATES?
- 6) PSE takes in over \$100 MILLION DOLLARS EVERY MONTH from just their electric customers alone.
- 7) Why is PSE ALLOWED TO INCLUDE as one of their REASONS to raise our rates because customers are using less electricity? People use less and less electricity because they can't afford PSE's higher and higher rates.

**PSE DOESN'T FOLLOW UTC'S ORDERS:**

- In 2013, the UTC ordered PSE to share its profits 50/50 with customers. I know of at least 2 more times, that the UTC also ordered PSE to share their profits with us. But somehow, PSE has found ways to get around this. They have NEVER shared their profits with us to lower our rates. How is it that PSE seems to have become more powerful than the UTC itself? PSE blatantly ignores and gets away with it, over and over again, UTC's direct orders to share their profits with their customers.

- When the UTC ordered PSE to share its profits 50/50 with customers, the Commission used what's called "earning tests" that required PSE to share excess profits with customers "in certain circumstances". This took place as part of a multi-year rate plan, and PSE's earnings would have had to go above an authorized amount before credits to customers were required. (The rate plan expired in 2017.)

- So....according to the "earning tests" PSE didn't make enough profits to share with their customers. **AND I WANT TO SAY...."BUT NOT BEFORE PROFITS WERE TURNED OVER BY PSE TO ITS SHAREHOLDERS."**

- PSE'S has a "Code of Conduct" that states that all their Corporate Officers, Treasurer, etc. "are empowered to ensure **THAT ALL STAKEHOLDER'S INTERESTS** (meaning Shareholder's interests, meaning profits) are appropriately balanced, protected and preserved."

- If PSE has re-constructed itself in such a way that profits to its shareholders come first, instead of savings to its customers....then this deranged arrangement needs to be taken up by the Attorney General's Office.

- If there are loop-holes in the way PSE has structured its utility company financially, then these loop-holes need to be closed. Where is the Attorney General, Bob Ferguson in all of this? I'm surprised he hasn't already stepped up to stop PSE in their tracks and **MAKE THEM TOW THE LINE** by ensuring that UTC's orders are followed, and that PSE shares their profits with their customers **FIRST**, to ensure they lower our rates. Let PSE use their millions of dollars in profits to **LOWER** our rates.

When I talk about an "Ethical Assessment" of PSE, **THIS IS KEY:** Why is PSE **ALLOWED** by UTC and Bob Ferguson in the OAG, to give away millions of dollars to the already very wealthy shareholders, while people in Washington State are shivering in their houses trying to keep warm because they can't afford to pay a higher electric bill? What sense does it make? **NONE!**

**WHO IS PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PSE CUSTOMERS and ENSURING OUR INTERESTS/ NEEDS** are "appropriately balanced, protected and preserved"?

- "In the end, the Commissioners must ensure that rates are fair, just and reasonable for all interests

involved.”

- PSE’s Shareholder’s interests are vastly different from PSE’s Customer’s interests. I feel these two “interests” should not be used in the same sentence, because their meaning is completely opposite one another.
- Customer “interest” is actually the Customer’s NEED....the need to stay warm in the winter and the need to still be able to afford to pay their ever rising PSE electric bill.
- The Shareholder’s interest means how much money (profits) they are able to make. In other words, the already wealthy becoming wealthier.
- Under this context, raising PSE customer’s electric rates every year is neither fair, just, nor reasonable: The wealthy don’t need protection, but the poor and vulnerable do.
- Being able to stay warm in our houses in the winter should be a Human Right. UTC – Do your job and DO WHAT IS RIGHT. PSE’s moral obligations and financial obligations should be one and the same. Right now, there is a huge cavern between them.

One last thought:

**MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF PSE PROFITS ARE BEING FUNNELED OUT OF WASHINGTON STATE AND THE U.S. EVERY YEAR. \$64.2 MILLION DOLLARS IN 2019 went to five Foreign Countries’ Pension Funds. That’s a HECK OF A LOT OF MONEY that could be well spent in our Local Communities:**

- The first priority should be for PSE to LOWER the costs of our energy bills.
- Then, how about investing in SUSTAINABLE, RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES....like SOLAR POWER.
- How about projects that help clean up our environment....protect our ecological natural resources....such as the vital salmon runs necessary for our food chain.
- How about helping to fund our schools. The fact is most of our schools are severely lacking enough Student Counselors....the Blaine Middle School has ONLY ONE COUNSELOR FOR OVER 400 STUDENTS, and the High School HAS TWO COUNSELORS FOR ABOUT 650 STUDENTS.....The NEED for more counselors is ENORMOUS – the highest number (about 65% to 70%) of calls to the National Suicide Help Line are students between 11 and 15 years old wanting to end their lives because they are so stressed out by school itself (the heavy over-load of academics, bullying, etc.) while about 30 % of the calls are due to bad situations at home. If you ask the schools why they don’t hire more Counselors, they’ll tell you they’d have to let a teacher go, because that’s all their budget will allow.

Filling the needs of how this money could be well spent in the state of Washington are vast and endless.  
Thank you. Cindy (Sandra E.) Kisska

	Judith Miller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Judith Miller</p>
	Sybille Vital	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to

			<p>pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,          Sybille Vital</p>
Lynne Ashton	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Lynne Ashton</p>
David Habib	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving



			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
Tom Voorhees	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>To risky, do not do it! Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tom Voorhees</p>
	Michael Bordenave	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to</p>

			<p>the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Michael Bordenave</p>
	Robert Johnson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Robert Johnson</p>

	Vivian Bartlett	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-----------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vivian Bartlett</p>
	Alison Hale	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p>

			<p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Alison Hale</p>
	Perry Gx	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Perry Gx</p>
	Gabrielle Keung	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Lauri Lindquist	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lauri Lindquist</p>
Porgies Tripper	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
Jonathan Pasley	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,	<p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>



impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jonathan Pasley</p>
Amber Khan	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p>

			Amber Khan
Lesley Morgan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>	

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Leah Wood	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>As a resident of Washington and former Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customer, I argue strongly that customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Leah Wood
	Stacey Romero	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          I've signed onto this well-written letter because I agree with it. I am not going to reinvent the wheel here and re-write the letter. I will just add a few words here. Do not reward those who seek to profit from planetary destruction. This is the work of selfish folk who only care about their own personal years on this planet and have no regard for the common good or for the future. Everyone involved has had (and still has) plenty of options to pursue that would be sustainable and less harmful. Those who are still in the game are in it wilfully and the rest of us should not be compensating them or their companies for their poor decisions. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	John Kersting	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

I hope each of you reads this long letter and understands that as also a teacher at Wa He Lut Indian School and Hood Canal School, I have gotten quite the earful, I mean- education of the present impacts on the new generations of native people impacted by the injustices of the previous Washington agencies whose present actions impact all our lives. I have been following this particular injustice for quite some time.

As a Parent, Journalist, Teacher and Community Leader as President of the Olympia Fraternal Organization of Eagles with over 450 members, I have been working on environmental issues for over 40 years. I remember back when our rivers were burning, Great Lakes dead and I am dead tired of corporate bullying in the name of profits for those who deserve none for poisoning our seas, air, food and lands. It is disturbingly hypocritical of our Department of Interior, industry representatives and politicians to have access to 40 years of foundational peer-reviewed documented evidence of harm and danger with our energy sources particularly oil, gas and coal yet to essentially give industry a complete pass on the true economic, environmental and health costs of these reckless methods of energy production. These industries must be held fully accountable for their devastating impact and make room for true progress with new standards and low impact energy sources. Our government agencies must follow their critical mandates and take the strongest actions possible to protect our planet, children and all future generations.

As a multi-continent deep sea diver and world traveler, I have personally been infuriated while watching as a slow train wreck continues in our environment, land air and water, where the use of fossil fuels has overwhelmed the incredible animal, plant, fragile environment and native peoples interests with flat out greed. The Exxon Valdez cleanup is incomplete, funds locked in lawsuits and all efforts have been inadequate and ineffective. The Deepwater Horizon has devastated that area and will for decades. The oil train fires and spills are legion and an unacceptable risk to the incredible wealth of our nation's treasured fisheries, landforms and water. Our government and corporations are a complete failure in showing responsibility with much more damage, oil spills and garbage strewn across many fragile landscapes with reckless abandon.

OUR nation's lands are valuable beyond measure, fragile beyond belief and threatened with a generations-long catastrophe for a product that should have been phased out long ago and threatens our survival ironically illustrated by the diminishing arctic ice and desertification of wide swathes of our planet including California. I am appalled as are a clear majority of Americans who seem to be regularly ignored by our representatives and weak-kneed governmental regulators, a failure on many grounds.

Everyone I know with any knowledge of this supports stronger safeguards and wants the DOI, BLM and all government agencies to take strong public policy actions that will ensure the long term safety of our communities and address the risks to our families now and in the future.

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, John Kersting</p>
	Linden Jordan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>



			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Sean Arent	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Everyone want to talk about inflation these days. But how does inflation happen? Have wages gone up? Slightly, as labor shortages due to the pandemic and poor working conditions have forced the hands of many corporations. But these meager increases are not across the board, and pale in comparison to the real driver of inflation- Corporate Greed. Housing cost across the region are spiking, and now PSE wants to increase utilities as well. This will deepen a crisis in affordability. PSE made a bad investment. They chose to further develop fossil fuel infrastructure when the public and climate are screaming anything but. They deserve to eat the costs of that mistake, not us as ratepayers. Ratepayers are already beginning to band together. There is talk of payment strike. The fallout of this will be immense, and it is up to this commission to prevent that. Sean Arent</p>
	Daniel Villa	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Tim Kerfoot	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Tim Kerfoot</p>
	<p>Ryan Davis</p> <p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p>

		<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Ryan Davis</p>
Stacy Oaks		<p>Dear Commissioners and Executive Director Maxwell,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Puget Sound Energy’s (PSE) requested rate increase, dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>Seattle Cruise Control is a grassroots organization working to educate the public and elected officials about how the cruise industry contributes to the climate emergency and harms public health, vulnerable shoreline communities, marine life, and exploited cruise industry workers. We advocate for a transition to a cruise-free Salish Sea. We have been following the most up-to-date information and research about ways large ships can mitigate their impacts on the climate crisis and human health. The bulk of our comment will focus on the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility and PSE’s claims that the facility is in the interest of the public because LNG would be a cleaner maritime fuel.</p> <p>LNG is not a climate solution for the shipping industry. The gas industry's claim that LNG is a climate solution has been disproven by multiple studies over the last several years. The claim is based on the fact that when burned, LNG emits less carbon dioxide than conventional fossil fuels, but ignores the reality that when lifecycle emissions from extraction to use (not just point of burning) are counted, LNG is as bad or worse for the climate than marine heavy fuel oil. Methane emissions during extraction, transport, and storage are much higher than previously reported, and methane traps 86 times more heat in the atmosphere than the same amount of carbon dioxide over a 20-year period.</p> <p>The International Maritime Organization is the United Nations agency tasked with regulating international shipping. It is well established that this organization has been captured by industry, and because of that, it operates in a secretive manner and has resisted passing any binding regulations that might impact industry profits. In 2018, the IMO formed a study group to determine whether LNG could be a solution for lowering the greenhouse gas emissions of maritime vessels. Even this industry-oriented body came to the conclusion that “LNG is not a climate solution for shipping”. The reasons for this conclusion include: the underestimation of methane slippage; fossil fuel infrastructure will have no place in a zero-emission future</p>

and as such will likely become a stranded asset; under many circumstances LNG has a higher greenhouse gas footprint than marine gas oil. The study concludes that “Instead of engaging in a complicated and ultimately unproductive shift from one fossil fuel to another, activities under the IMO GHG Strategy should focus on delivering short term emission reductions in the existing fleet and speeding up the development of genuine low carbon fuels and the roll out of zero emission vessels.”

These results and conclusions were confirmed by the International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT), in their 2020 working paper The Climate Implications of Using LNG as a Marine Fuel. They found that although LNG emits 25% less carbon dioxide than conventional marine fuel oils for the same amount of propulsion power, the methane leaks during extraction, processing, transport, and burning mean that there is no climate benefit from using it. The most popular LNG marine engine is also the leakiest, resulting in 70% to 80% more life-cycle greenhouse gases than from marine gas oil. The ICCT concluded that LNG is not only not a long-term solution to marine climate impacts, it's not a short-term solution either.

More recently, on April 16, 2021, the World Bank issued a report: The Role of LNG in the Transition Toward Low- and Zero-Carbon Shipping, which came to the following conclusion: "Based on the uncertain benefits, additional capital expenditures, risk of technology 'lock-in,' and a high potential for more damaging GHG emissions through methane leakage, the research recommends that countries should avoid new public policy that supports LNG as a bunker fuel, reconsider existing policy support, and continue to regulate methane emissions [emphasis ours]."

We are concerned that the Utilities and Transportation Commission continues to consider reimbursing PSE or other corporations for new, expanded, or upgraded fossil fuel infrastructure under the banner of being in the public interest. This is despite the fact that every year, warnings by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change become more dire, and communities all around the globe experience worsening weather-related catastrophes. Here in Washington, the June, 2021 heat dome resulted in over 800 deaths, and devastated the state's shellfish and its cherry, wheat, and onion crops. The increasing severity and duration of wildfires destroys millions of acres of Washington forests, and the resulting smoke causes heart and lung disease, and death. "Climate change is the single greatest threat to human health on the planet, and it will be for the foreseeable future," says Dr. Jeffrey Duchin, health officer at Public Health - Seattle & King County.

Investing in activities that are destabilizing our planet cannot be in the public's interest. PSE could be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Please deny any rate increases for the Tacoma LNG and the Colestrip coal-fired power plant.

We must also consider the environmental justice aspects of the LNG plant. Continued investments in fossil

			<p>fuel infrastructure harm more than just our climate, with all of the associated health, economic, and societal impacts. The extraction of fracked gas is linked to a myriad of harms, including increased asthma, cancer and birth defects in surrounding communities; polluted groundwater; earthquakes; habitat and species loss; an increase in the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women; and violence and sovereignty violations against Indigenous communities. Polluting extraction sites and refineries are often placed in Black, Brown, Indigenous, low-income, and already overburdened communities.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is an example of this racist refinery placement in action. The plant is directly adjacent to the Puyallup Reservation, in an already highly toxic area. The Puyallup Tribe, a sovereign nation, requested health and safety studies be part of the permitting process and the Tacoma Human Rights Commission supported the request, yet both were ignored by the lead SEPA permitting agency. Puget Sound Energy began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits, yet no agencies were willing to hold PSE accountable. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the facility's permits in court. In order to break the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governmental agencies must stop looking the other way in the face of these harmful business-as-usual tactics. The Utilities and Transportation Commission has an opportunity to do so by denying PSE's rate increase request.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not be forced to pay for infrastructure that is primarily for non-residential purposes. The gas will only be used for residential purposes on a few days a year, if at all, for peak-shaving, and permits for the facility claim that this will only be a purpose for the first ten years of the lease before the gas is used exclusively for non-residential purposes. People everywhere are already struggling to pay utility bills, rent/mortgages, and the rising costs of groceries. It is unacceptable and unconscionable to add this burden when it will not improve services.</p> <p>Please deny all of PSE's requested rate increases.</p>
	Bill Picatti	E-mail	<p>My main issue with this request is that PSE is asking for a rate increase for a yet to be approved project (Energize Eastside). PSE has been trying to get this project approved for years, using false data and information. They have even started the work without all the necessary permits. In addition, they are requesting a 10% rate of return that could be in place for many decades.</p> <p>PSE should not be rewarded with a rate increase and money for their foreign shareholders for the lies they have told in support of their ill-fated project!</p>
	Justin Hentges	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067        The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Justin Hentges</p>
	Hezekiah Rust	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Jessi Presley-Gruisin</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>John Smith</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. I have been a PSE (Puget Power) customer for over 45 years; I have seen that company prioritize profits to</p>



			<p>its investors over service to its customers for decades. For example we are still paying for the Bacus Hill Nuclear plant which, fortunately was never constructed, but nonetheless had millions spent on it. PSE continues to resist the required move to reduce greenhouse gases in its electric production, a move required by the State of Washington. Its LNG facility ought NOT to be included in this rate request; it is a BOONDOGGLE by PSE!</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>John Smith        jmyronsmith@gmail.com        Clear Lake, Washington 98235-0337</p>
	Stacy Oaks	E-mail	<p>To: Commissioners and Executive Director Maxwell        Re: Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>We stand with the Puyallup Tribe in strongly opposing PSE's request to once again raise their electric and gas rates. The Attorney General's Public Counsel Unit opposes these rate hikes, saying "they have not justified the extent of the rate increases they request"...and they are not "fair, just, and reasonable". The</p>

			<p>Washington Clean Energy Coalition also opposes the rate increases.</p> <p>PSE’s proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. That is because PSE is seeking compensation for previous and current unwise infrastructure projects, like the Tacoma LNG Refinery and the Lake Hills Transmission Lines. Both of these projects were vigorously opposed by community members. They are also significantly harmful for the environment. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing permits in court for the Tacoma LNG refinery, whose pollution will disproportionately impact overburdened and marginalized communities. Less than 2% of this facility is intended to serve residential customers, who could be stuck paying over 40% of construction costs. In fact, the main customer will be the maritime industry.</p> <p>PSE deceives the public by advertising a green energy future while continuing to invest and expand fossil fuel projects. Their actions ignore the climate crisis and the wishes of their customers. PSE inflates demand for natural gas while, in reality, states are passing legislation that requires cleaner energy and bans natural gas in new buildings. This is a prime example of their profit driven focus and lack of commitment to invest in clean energy options. The Tacoma LNG facility is touted as being in the public interest because of widely disproven claims that LNG is a climate solution for shipping. Actually, it is worse for the climate than existing fuels.</p> <p>PSE should not be rewarded for the blatant disregard of their customers and the environment. They need to be held accountable for their history of poor engagement with the communities they serve, their misrepresentation of environmental concerns, their lack of transparency, and their continued support for polluting energy sources.</p> <p>Currently, many homeowners and renters are struggling to pay their bills and stay in their homes. They should not have to bear the financial burden created by PSE. Please reject this rate hike.</p>
	Nicholas Shefling	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure</p>
	Erika Bartlett	E-mail	<p>ilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. On the contrary, the City could protect their residents, fine PSE for construction before obtaining permits, and dedicate the proceeds to seeking newly available federal and state funds supporting electrification of home heating and air conditioning, prioritizing low-income homeowners and multifamily buildings serving low-income renters.</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Natalie Franz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Natalie Franz</p>
	Stacia Miller	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers and causes unacceptable environmental justice impacts, including on the Puyallup Tribe. In addition, it is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and sets a bad precedent for how energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project.</p>

Please deny so as to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project that damages the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This situation elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, a hospital, churches, and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk.

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change. When methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project. Please ensure that ratepayers and local communities, including the Puyallup Tribe, are not on the hook for this dangerous, ill-conceived, backwards-looking facility.</p>
	Barbara Carey	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Barbara Carey</p>
	Kara Hodges	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to</p>

		<p>the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Kara Hodges</p>
Vickie Rettke	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>As a retired school teacher that retired this year I do not need my rates of PSE to increase. I am on a pension and with the rise of food and gas I do not need my heating bill to go up too.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>



			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure</p>
	LYDIA LEIMBACH	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, LYDIA LEIMBACH</p>
Chelsea Vetter	E-mail		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Aside from the fact this deal is evil and goes against all common sense it's also putting a lot of families at risk. Even the slightest over this basic need can increase chances of a houseless situation. Please don't do this, I do not get paid a livable wage as it is! You made the mistake you figure it out Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	betsy dickes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, betsy dickes</p>
	Brad Thompson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Deborah Parker	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.

- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you,  
Deborah Parker

	Patricia Estes	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Lucinda Stroud	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects.</p>

			<p>Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Lucinda Stroud</p>
	Gretchen Clay	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>



			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gretchen Clay</p>
	Candance Robles	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery.</p>

			<p>The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Jazzmin Fragiacamò	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	William Golding	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, William Golding</p>
	Carmela Micheli	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.
Breana Melvin	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.	
Elsie Sabel	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay	

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Elsie Sabel</p>
Stephen Neal	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples'</li></ul>



			<p>homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	John Stuhlmiller, Washington State Water Resources	Email	<p>**See attached comment**</p> <p>The Washington State Water Resources Association (WSWRA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the rate increase proposed by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). WSWRA is a trade association representing Washington irrigation districts and irrigation companies, and other agricultural and municipal water providers throughout Washington. WSWRA's members deliver water to enable billions of dollars of food production annually. Water is the lifeblood of food and fiber production in Washington, and our members strive to ensure adequate water is delivered. On behalf of our members, including Cascade Irrigation District, we wish to express our concerns related to the dramatic rate increases proposed by PSE. While we appreciate that costs have increased and new liabilities have been placed on utilities, this is not singular to electric utilities. Our members have struggled to continue to provide water at reasonable prices to their customers, the farmers who feed us and provide a significant share of Washington's economy. We have watched costs increase across the board, and irrigation districts continue to feel these</p>

			<p>pressures while impacted by the fact they are non-profit entities constrained by the reality that their rate base (farmers) are unable to raise the prices. Farmers are price takers not setters. So as costs rise on inputs (including electricity) their profitability is compromised.</p> <p>As you consider this rate case, we hope you will keep these facts in mind. Especially the dramatic jump in schedule #35 rates (which includes irrigation water). If rates must be increased, the increase should come more gradually to allow districts to adjust their budgets and farmers can seek ways to address the additional costs.</p> <p>Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on this matter. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.</p>
Sean Arent	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.	

	Kirsten Schneider	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	-------------------	--------	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Daniel Raphael	Email <p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Daniel Raphael</p>
	Arnold Strang	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
Alex Peterson	Email	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am writing regarding Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increase.</p> <p>I am opposed to any rate increase that is used to fund or supply natural gas or other carbon-emitting energy sources.</p> <p>If they want to raise money through rate increases, and it is within the UTC's power, then I suggest limiting increased funds to only apply to programs that either reduce carbon emissions, improve electricity reliability/resiliency, or support low-income customers.</p> <p>Because of the urgency in transforming energy consumption to address the climate crisis, combined with inflation and the difficult economic reality for many Americans at this time, rate increases should NOT be used to pay for: anything related to natural gas, or increasing profits beyond current levels.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alex Peterson</p>
Barbara Gregg	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	David Arntson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>



			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        David Arntson</p>
	Kathy Mallalieu	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Marilyn Boyd	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Marilyn Boyd</p>
	Megan Hoerler	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p>

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Vanessa Jamison	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vanessa Jamison</p>
	Robert and Judy DeJardin	Email	<p>Utility Commission:</p> <p>Please add my objection to the proposed Puget Sound Energy rate increases for Electricity and Natural Gas Services. In a phrase, the increase is far too high at 13.59% and 12.98% respectively. PSE is a for-profit company holding hostage those unlucky enough to be housed in their service areas, resulting in relocation as our only option to avoid outrageous costs slated to rise annually.</p> <p>Please stop the madness and limit raises in costs to consumers to less than 5% annually. I understand costs rise; I do not understand or support double digit raises with subsequent annual raises as proposed.</p>

			<p>Thank you for consideration of my concern,</p> <p>Robert and Judy DeJardin</p>
Victoria Urias	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Elizabeth Clarke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the</p>



			<p>construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Elizabeth Clarke</p>
	Robert North	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Emily Warner	E-mail	<p>Please consider restraining any price gouging from the electric utility companies. It may not seem like alot but for people on the edge thats the difference between buying a buspass or getting basic tv entertainment. Many of us have budgets that tight.</p>

	Gena DiLabio	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	--------------	--------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Gena DiLabio</p>
	Bradley Thompson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Randal Ternes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay</p>

for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth

		<p>in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
Joseph Hiss	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). However, the LNG (liquefied natural gas) terminal is clearly not needed in these days of global warming, because it is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. To this end, I urge you to deny the Tacoma LNG project.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>A. Most importantly, this facility harms our climate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. As a retired biological scientist formerly working in local salmon restoration, I am aware of a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG (greenhouse gases) must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. But development of the LNG (liquefied natural gas) project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state climate goals and hindering transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>2. LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change. But even if it leaks without burning, it is about 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>3. I understand the LNG terminal would emit about the same amount of GHG as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>4. Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage continued use of fracked gas by marine vessel customers. Doing so would contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ol> <p>B. This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. LNG gives off air pollutants like methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds.</li><li>2. The Facility will store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods adjacent to the Port. This means more risk of disaster for thousands who live or work in the Port and Tideflats area, which includes homes, schools, churches, and daycare facilities.</li></ol> <p>C. This facility is not needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed, since demand for gas will likely continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections.</li></ol>

			<p>2. PSE said during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers like me. Yet, as I understand it, they want to charge us 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to burden us for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost.</p> <p>3. The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. We should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>For all these reasons, I urge you to deny the prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, most importantly, so that we don't have to pay for harm to the planet and its people.</p> <p>Thank you, Joseph Hiss</p>
Kathleen Bailey	Email		<p>I have been on PSE for 30 years. I have planned and prepared for retirement. What I didn't anticipate was an extreme increase in electric and gas rates. In spite of being very mindful of what I can do in my home to conserve energy, the 2022 increase resulted in me paying an additional several hundred dollars to adjust my budget payment. PSE has never been shy proposing rate increases.</p> <p>Inflation is already stretching finances much less PSE adding their unrealistic request while paying literally millions to their shareholders. PSE states there will be assistance available to those unable to cope with their monthly bill. It seems insane to place an additional burden to others which could be avoided if only rates were not excessively expensive. PSE is one of the most expensive providers of electricity and the only one to provide natural gas. They continue to become BIGGER and BIGGER covering a larger area and have a monopoly.</p> <p>I know PSE is working to comply with the state mandate on energy to decarbonize. Maybe that timeline needs to be adjusted. Customers cannot continue to subsidize this agenda.</p> <p>TPU is requesting a 4% increase and Steilacoom a similar single digit proposal.</p> <p>My only alternative to get out from PSE's for profit company is to move from my home to a non PSE residence. I have prepared and maintained my house allowing me to keep my residence.</p> <p>The reality of this is that most PSE customers are not even aware of this proposed request. A friend shared with me. I'm sure it was mentioned in a PSE bill but unfortunately most people simply pay the bill without reading much else until they noticed an increase from the 2022 rate increase.</p> <p>Electricity and Natural Gas should not become a luxury.</p>

			<p>I respectfully ask you to reconsider the proposed PSE increase.</p> <p>Kathleen Bailey</p>
Hezekiah Rust	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Alexa Fay	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need</p>

			<p>to deny all reimbursement for this facility. Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future. Alexa Fay</p>
Timothy Boyd	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats</li></ul>

			<p>area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</p> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Shauna Boyd	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li></ul>

			<p>facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	nancy corr	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , PLEASE DO NOT RAISE UTILITY RATES !! Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas

			<p>(LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>nancy corr</p>
	Patricia Johnson	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). I am a PSE customer and supporter of their Green Power Program because the science is clear that we must drastically reduce our use of fossil fuels. And I don’t support the construction and implementation of a LNG facility for the following reasons: The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, like me. The facility has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Karen Caton	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you,        Karen Caton</p>
	Stephen Grumm	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li> <li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the</li> </ul>



			<p>facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Tika Bordelon	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Tika Bordelon</p>
	Sarah Deumling	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Don Marsh	E-mail	<p>The Washington Clean Energy Coalition would like to submit a verbal comment at the Sept. 28 hearing regarding PSE's General Rate Case. I have developed a comment that can be delivered in about 3 and a half minutes. In the Commission's announcement of the meeting, I see no suggestion regarding testimony length or if any limits will be applied. Is this comment likely to be accepted in its entirety, or will a shorter limit be enforced?</p> <p>Also, will the Commissioners attend this meeting, or is it being run exclusively by the Administrative Law Judge?</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Don Marsh</p>
	Vanessa Jamison	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Randal Ternes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Randal Ternes</p>
Frances Marquart	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	David Bluhm	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Please consider this as an addendum to a letter I previously submitted regarding docket items UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>RCW 80.01.040, in part, delineates that the Washington "Utilities and Transportation Commission (hereinafter WA UTC) shall regulate in the public interest, as provided by the public service laws, the rates, services, facilities, and practices of all persons engaging within this state in the business of supplying any utility service or commodity to the public for compensation".</p> <p>The mission statement proclaimed by the WA UTC is "to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced".</p> <p>Please note that ensuring the success and/or solvency of retirement funds and pension plans for both private and government employees of the country of Canada are NOT INCLUDED in your oath nor your mission statement.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy is owned by a Canadian Corporation whose mission includes ensuring the success and solvency of Canadian public and private retirement funds. Puget Sound Energy and their parent company have lied and violated building codes and laws repeatedly to attempt to ensure their ongoing success and</p>



profitability, all while claiming that they are doing it for the people of Washington. Rewarding those lies and violations of the laws of Washington and the United States of America by allowing the utility rate increases Puget Sound Energy seeks is essentially treasonous of your duties on the WA UTC and clearly NOT in the best interests nor protective of the people of Washington state. In fact, it is the opposite and it is contrary to your oaths of office and proclaimed mission. According to RCW Titles 80 and 81, Washington State law "requires that utility and transportation rates must be reasonable to customers, giving regulated companies a chance to cover legitimate costs and earn a fair profit, so they can stay in business. What is fair to the company, and at the same time fair to the people and businesses it serves, is what the commission must decide many times over." In this time of economic recession and seemingly exponentially expanding inflation and environmental catastrophe due to global warming and climate change, it is not reasonable nor fair to the people of Washington, whom are by far the largest number that you serve. Puget Sound Energy customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery/storage facility or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with rate increases (dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067), tax incentives, or any other economic subsidy tactics. This is especially true when considering RCW chapter 80.82, which specifies that coal fired power plant closures and decommissioning are to be priorities regulated by the WA UTC. Furthermore, with the Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice still in the process of appealing and ensuring the repeal of construction permits in court for the controversial LNG refinery and storage facility on the Port of Tacoma - these rate increases will only add insult to injury and lead to a precedent of "just build it and it will be approved" by more and more foreign corporations looking to capitalize on the people of Washington. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these proceedings is because Puget Sound Energy began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits and somehow compelled the Washington State Department of Ecology to pass oversight of environmental impact studies to the Tacoma City Council. Puget Sound Energy should not be rewarded for their bullying, law breaking, clearly corrupt and deceitful tactics. Approving the sought after rate increases would be just such a reward. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities – namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. Impacts and injustices that have been recognized and declared by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the WA UTC need to understand and act directly on the impacts to overburdened and historically marginalized communities in their decision making. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on hydraulically refractured (aka "fracked") gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects and 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquake proliferation due to geologic disturbances caused by extraction methods, and destruction of habitat for native

			<p>aqua and terra flora and fauna.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle (full system, cradle to grave) emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC must stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure which exacerbates the methane emissions. Especially now that it is known that methane is the leading greenhouse gas contributing to and accelerating climate change and global warming.</p> <p>It is past time to END Puget Sound Energy's Trail of Lies and Half Truths steeped in intentional and willful ignorance, arrogance, greed and record profits. And it is time to STOP rewarding Puget Sound Energy's corrupt, duplicit, deceitful business practices and truly protect the public your pledged to serve.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, attention, consideration, and right action to protect the people of Washington.</p>
	Sarah Kowalski	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Kathleen Evans	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to</p>

greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving

			<p>149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
Mark Canright	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Ian McCluskey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility</p>

			<p>will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Ian McCluskey</p>
	Lonnie Davenport	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane,</li></ul>

			<p>near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Randal Ternes	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>



		<p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms</p>
--	--	---

			<p>highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Randal Ternes</p>
Barbara Kelson	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Vanessa Rabito	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Vanessa Rabito</p>
	Aisha Farhoud	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere

			<p>uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Marlene Matola	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The</p>

			UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.
	Hugh Caton	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate</li></ul>

			<p>large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Hugh Caton</p>
Kathleen Gylland	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Kathleen Gylland</p>
	Vy-Hoa Pantastico	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.

			<p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Vy-Hoa Pantastico</p>
	Amy Scott	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p>

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

			Thank you, Amy Scott
Jared Howe	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public. This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Jared Howe	
Benjamin Scott	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation. The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what	

			<p>constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Benjamin Scott bscott6031@hotmail.com</p>
Megan Cornish	E-mail		<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact on the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy company can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane to smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area — and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Megan Cornish</p>
	Carole Richmond	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable</p>

impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Carole Richmond</p>
	Darlene O'Grady	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li></ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Darlene O'Grady</p>
	Sherry Bupp	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so

			<p>would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</p> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Sally Hurst	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>

			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Ben Sharpe	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am writing to voice. My displeasure with Puget Sound energy is proposed rate increases, which are well higher than the rate of inflation, and they are putting in for increases tied to infrastructure projects which haven't even been completed and the public is not getting benefit from.</p> <p>Additionally, now is a terrible time to increase power cost for Washington families to line the pockets of private equity owned Puget Sound energy.</p> <p>Instead, Puget Sound energy should continue to invest in solar and battery and stop these crazy infrastructure projects which aren't needed!</p> <p>Please include these comments in the record.</p> <p>Ben Sharpe Mercer Island, Wa</p>

	Sophia Keller	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li></ul>
--	---------------	--------	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
Sophia Keller	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Sophia Keller</p>
	David Galazin	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized</p>

			<p>communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Theresa Almuti	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li> <li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li> <li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li> </ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li> <li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li> <li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Claudia White	E-mail	<p>This raise in pricing is insane not to mention many families, elderly, and disabled, are already suffering. Please consider this!!</p> <p>Claudia White        Kent Wa</p>
	Katherine Bos	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record</p>

is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	William Young	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks</li></ul>

			<p>and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Kim Drury	E-mail	<p>September 23, 2022</p> <p>Washington Transportation and Utilities Commission Olympia, WA</p> <p>RE: Puget Sound Energy's General Electric Rate Case, Docket #220066</p> <p>Commissioners:</p> <p>We are residents of Whidbey Island and customers of Puget Sound Energy's electric service. We would like to offer the following comments regarding Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We urge the Commission to approve nearly all of the provisions of the partial multiparty settlement</li></ul>

			<p>between Puget Sound Energy (PSE) and the joint environmental advocates, i.e., Sierra Club, the NW Energy Coalition and Front and Centered. In their advocacy, the three environmental organizations have done an excellent job of better ensuring that PSE is meeting its commitments to clean and equitable electric energy service. In short, the settlement agreement appears to be a far better outcome for both the climate and for consumers than what PSE had originally proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nonetheless, an electric rate increase of nearly 10 percent in 2023, followed by another increase in 2024 of 1.5 percent is substantial and will be a real hardship for many people. At the same time PSE is seeking such a large rate increase, the company is not meeting its performance metric for reliability. Here on Whidbey Island, outages are far too common; system wide, PSE's performance on reliability has gone down for the past two years. Thus, we object to awarding the company a ROE of 9.4 percent while customers are experiencing less reliability and higher costs.</li> <li>• The Clean Energy Transformation Act requires utilities to ensure that all customers are benefiting from the clean energy transition, particularly "highly impacted communities" and "vulnerable populations" i.e., those who are most affected by climate change and have not benefited from the transition to clean energy.</li> </ul> <p>Customers who heat with delivered fuels (i.e., oil, propane and wood) are common in rural areas like Whidbey Island where we don't have natural gas infrastructure. These are customers who have not had the benefit of access to traditional PSE programs like weatherization (excepting state low-income weatherization programs.) Nor are they eligible for heat pump incentives so that they can cool their homes in these increasingly hot summers. These are customers, then, who face real barriers in conserving energy, saving money and cutting their GHG emissions - and in enjoying cooler and cleaner air during heat and/or smoke events. At the same time, they are subject to expensive, unregulated and volatile fuel prices. Thus, in our view,</p> <p>it is essential that these customers be included within the definition of highly impacted communities and that PSE actively support their transition to electric heating and cooling. Including them benefits rate payers and shareholders by contributing to PSE meeting its decarbonization and equity goals.</p> <p>The settlement includes up to \$15 million for a targeted electrification pilot to help customers (including those with delivered fuels) move to heat pumps - which we strongly endorse.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our views.</p>
	Kim Drury	E-mail	<p>September 24, 2022</p> <p>Washington Transportation and Utilities Commission</p>

Olympia, WA

RE: Puget Sound Energy's General Electric Rate Case, Docket #220066

Commissioners:

We are residents of Whidbey Island and customers of Puget Sound Energy's electric service. We would like to offer the following comments regarding Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increase.

- We urge the Commission to approve nearly all of the provisions of the partial multiparty settlement between Puget Sound Energy (PSE) and the joint environmental advocates, i.e., Sierra Club, the NW Energy Coalition and Front and Centered. In their advocacy, the three environmental organizations have done an excellent job of better ensuring that PSE is meeting its commitments to clean and equitable electric energy service. In short, the settlement agreement appears to be a far better outcome for both the climate and for consumers than what PSE had originally proposed.
- Nonetheless, an electric rate increase of nearly 10 percent in 2023, followed by another increase in 2024 of 1.5 percent is substantial and will be a real hardship for many people. At the same time PSE is seeking such a large rate increase, the company is not meeting its performance metric for reliability. Here on Whidbey Island, outages are far too common; system wide, PSE's performance on reliability has gone down for the past two years. Thus, we object to awarding the company a ROE of 9.4 percent while customers are experiencing less reliability and higher costs.
- The Clean Energy Transformation Act requires utilities to ensure that all customers are benefiting from the clean energy transition, particularly "highly impacted communities" and "vulnerable populations" i.e., those who are most affected by climate change and have not benefited from the transition to clean energy.

Customers who heat with delivered fuels (i.e., oil, propane and wood) are common in rural areas like Whidbey Island where we don't have natural gas infrastructure. These are customers who have not had the benefit of access to traditional PSE programs like weatherization (excepting state low-income weatherization programs.) Nor are they eligible for heat pump incentives so that they can cool their homes in these increasingly hot summers. These are customers, then, who face real barriers in conserving energy, saving money and cutting their GHG emissions - and in enjoying cooler and cleaner air during heat and/or smoke events. At the same time, they are subject to expensive, unregulated and volatile fuel prices. Thus, in our view,

it is essential that these customers be included within the definition of highly impacted communities and that PSE actively support their transition to electric heating and cooling. Including them benefits rate payers and

			<p>shareholders by contributing to PSE meeting its decarbonization and equity goals.</p> <p>The settlement includes up to \$15 million for a targeted electrification pilot to help customers (including those with delivered fuels) move to heat pumps - which we strongly endorse.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our views.</p>
	Heather Price	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers, including my elderly parents and in-laws, should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. As an atmospheric chemist who focuses on air pollution and climate, I understand how the pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>As an atmospheric chemist and climate scientist I conducted research and teaching with the University of Washington's Program on Climate Change and I am telling you PSE is wrong on the science too. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. The science is clear, and PSE is wrong. LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for methane (so-called natural) gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of methane gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of methane gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by my colleagues at the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Sarah Randolph	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas</p>

			<p>(LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Martha Ramos	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>



			<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Martha Ramos</p>
	Ted E Duncan	Email	I am against the gas rate increase.it is not justified .
	lpotzler@gmail.com	Email	PSE's request to raise rates to ensure their shareholders an unreasonably high return on their money at the expense of the users of the utility is unacceptable. Please deny their request. Thank you.
	Tara	Email	<p>My name is Tara. I'm one of over 40,000 renters in Bellingham, and a member of the Bellingham Tenants Union. I'm here to urge you to reject PSE's filing for a rate increase. Tenants (like everyone else surviving on stagnant wages) are paying higher portions of our income for utilities, because of high inflation. PSE has made a profit for decades and should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers, for providing a public necessity. It's unacceptable that they are proposing we finance their continued profits while they continue to destroy my children's future and planet.</p> <p>What would the rate increase mean for my family? I'm a renter, renting a home that is poorly insulated. That means I pay hundreds of dollars a month in the winter to pay for heat. Last year, we had to limit heating to the common rooms to control our heating costs. I can assure you, our wages are not rising by 9%. The fossil fuel economy is most harmful to the poorest people in our communities, and most extractive in tribal territories as well as public lands - PSE is no exception. When our government agencies subsidize fossil fuel burning corporations - like PSE - they use our precious resources as tax payers to fund those subsidies. Yet when they incentivize renewable energy, low wage workers, especially renters, don't benefit, and in fact, as in this case, pay a disproportionately larger portion of our income. As the government agency tasked to protect consumers of utilities, I expect you to reign in increased profiteering by corporations like PSE. I ask</p>

			<p>you to ease the burden on tenants, and make sure that ALL our young people have a planet they can sustainably and respectfully live on.</p> <p>Tara</p>
	Davis Pitt	E-mail	<p>Pse bills are going to rise and I'm totally against it. I am on a fixed income how can I afford that and how can you do this to us. Nancy Pitt please don't raise the rates</p>
	Alexandra Wheeler	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health,</p>

			<p>water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p>
	Ryan Massey	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p>
	Lisa Dennison	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the</p>

			<p>Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Doris Lum	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

		<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Brian Thayer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Brian Thayer</p>
	Rene Dubay	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Mark Volmut	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel</p>

			<p>infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Yvonne Meziere	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Yvonne Meziere</p>
Richard Wesley	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Judith Hance	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>



			<p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>Because I have a gas furnace, I have to be a customer of PSE, which needs to pay its OWN bills caused by a facility that should not exist!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Hance</p>
	Robert Holzworth	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>

			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Dr. Marilyn Cornwell	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Faye Bartlett	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p>

		<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Willie Ragin	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I remember in the 90's when PSE sold energy to California. The people ended up paying for this act when the state later had a lack of rain. As a result, our rates doubled and never were reduced. Tacoma Utilities are using the citizens as a cash cow and pricing the everyday citizens out of Tacoma and affordable electricity. If you continue to raise rates, how will the working people be able to survive and live in this area?</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. Should any facility or project be built with public funds, must be able to show sustainability. Once it reaches profitability, rates should be returned to pre-project rates.</p> <p>PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened the working communities in their decision. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the general public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>I believe that any future projects should always consider renewable energy resources.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Willie Ragin</p>
Dr. Lorraine Hartmann	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>No you are not allowed to raise the energy price. No way, no how. I do not support this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Ronald Skarvan	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p>

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ronald Skarvan</p>
	Dr. David Cauffman	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>Why does our utility company charge more for green energy? It has its incentives backwards. I do not want my utility dollars to be invested in the scourge of fossil fuel energy sources. Climate matters. As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. David Cauffman</p>
Erik Larue	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." We have seen the catastrophic effects of climate change, and without immediate action our communities will continue to suffer. Please do all you can to reform and modernize our energy sector so we can meet the needs of Washingtonians during these unprecedented times. Thank you.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>	
Marian Karpoff	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the</p>	

			<p>Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I oppose this proposal --no rate hikes that involve fossil fuels!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Marian Karpoff</p>
	Kathy Wilmering	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I just received this email and so am responding on the cusp of 9/28/22.</p> <p>Christian principles support making decisions that minimize painful impacts on people who are marginalized, as well as ones that prioritize stewardship of the planet's resources. PSE's moving forward with the Tacoma LNG project despite the protests of the Puyallup Tribe and other affected groups goes against both of these. It is too bad that PSE decided to fund the LNG without waiting, but ordinary customers should not have to pay</p>

			<p>for their woeful decisions.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathy Wilmering</p>
	Keith Skore	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." We have seen the catastrophic effects of climate change, and without immediate action our communities will continue to suffer. Please do all you can to reform and modernize our energy sector so we can meet the needs of Washingtonians during these unprecedented times. Thank you.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>



			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Rev Erik Kindem	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith and pastoral leader, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rev Erik Kindem</p>

	Ruth Lau	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." We have seen the catastrophic effects of climate change, and without immediate action our communities will continue to suffer. Please do all you can to reform and modernize our energy sector so we can meet the needs of Washingtonians during these unprecedented times. Thank you.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Janet McDermott	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system.</p> <p>In recent years the concept of fracking has become an unacceptable desperate attempt to preserve past fuel shortage needs to the detriment of our planet. This attempt to impact PSE's customers with an increased rate</p>

			<p>change adds another layer of unacceptable practices - for services they aren't even provided!</p> <p>PSE's stated ethic is to "do what is right." Then respect the rights of the persons they serve.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Rev. Michael Wilson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rev. Michael Wilson</p>
	fred karlson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, fred karlson</p>
	Daniel Evans	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

			<p>PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." The LNG facility is wrong on many fronts. It violates United States treaties with the Puyallup Tribe and other indigenous groups. It expands the use of fossil fuels that have caused, and will continue to cause, grave injury to the land, water, and other resources that the Creator has blessed us with. Our children, including yours, should not have to suffer from our damage to the earth. Stop the polluting and help restore our world to a healthy climate.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Julia Cochrane	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system.</p> <p>Jefferson County left PSE and became its own Public Utility District. And every day I live in gratitude for this. I am opposed to the inequity inherent in this rate hike. And I am opposed to creating anymore greenhouse gasses or blast zones, both of which are the largest outcomes of the proposed LNG facility.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel</p>

			<p>infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Nancy Johnson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Ms. Nancy Johnson
	Nancy Jacobs	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>It is simply a bad idea to subsidize new fossil fuel infrastructure, which damages our environment. The Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations were right to oppose the Tacoma LNG facility because of this harm. As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	David Pelto	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p>

			<p>Increasing rates to cover the costs of a project that clearly goes against the State's goals of reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Pelto</p>
	John Giesler	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen</p>



			<p>to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Judith Anderegg	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I do not support the proposed LNG facility of Puget Sound Energy nor do I support our being charged for said facility.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Anderegg</p>

Dr. Suzanne Crawford-O'Brien	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who works in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. Suzanne Crawford-O'Brien Native American Studies and Religion Pacific Lutheran University</p>
Rev. Catharine Cline	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel</p>

		<p>infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Rev. AC Churchill	Email <p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Rev. AC Churchill
	Karen Erlander	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	adash@dubsa nddash.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Judith Ryan	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>

			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Catherine Ruha	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>This is simply wrong that this investor-owned utility is proposing a rate increase that is unprecedented in its scope and scale to help pay for the cost of Tacoma LNG. The Puyallup Tribe said NO to Tacoma LNG, I said no, so many other citizens of this state said no. And, yet Tacoma and Washington State let colonialism prevail. I am not paying for PSE's harm. Loving action in care for the Puyallup Tribe needed to prevail here.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

	Donna Ward	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.</p> <p>It is not ethical to require us to pay for fracking or natural gas improvements</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Donna Ward</p>
	Kristen Daley Mosier	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility</p>

			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kristen Daley Mosier</p>
Shary B.	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>



			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Cathie Hamilton	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>Opposing PSE rate increases-dockets UE-220066 and UG- 220067</p> <p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>With costs rising in all aspects of daily living, this rate hike proposal is not only immoral-it is impossible.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>This is not a consumer problem-this is a budget management problem.</p> <p>The price increase will not even be going towards gas/electric locally, but rather benefiting the Tacoma LNG facility.</p> <p>Find a different solution to YOUR money problem.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cathie Hamilton</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

			<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mrs. Cathie Hamilton</p>
Elizabeth Berggren	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Howard Harrison	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

			<p>PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>It is outrageous that PSE is asking us to pay for the LNG facility which was built without all permits and without approval from the indigenous tribe.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Howard Harrison</p>
	Carolyn Treadway	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Krista Mathistad	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>My name is Krista Mathistad, and I am the Director of Community Engagement at Bethel Lutheran Church in Shoreline. The proposed rate increases by PSE are unfair, selfish, and unequitable in the name of environmental justice. I strongly oppose these proposed rate increases and their connection to the over-reliance of fossil fuels in this time of climate crisis.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Krista Mathistad
Beverly Parsons	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>	
Larkin Flor	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>	

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Larkin Flor</p>
	Dr. David Newman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>To construct additional LNG export terminals is to help the planet commit suicide. Any expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure is sheer, dangerous insanity. Burning fossil fuel must be phased out, starting now, and must be 50% complete in less than 8 years. Federal policy is finally starting to move in this direction after decades of unconscionable delay. Asking Washington ratepayers to subsidize this insanity is adding insult to injury. Furthermore it inflicts unnecessary damage on the local environment and nearby residents.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

			<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Rev M Perdcy	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>Stop planning and building infrastructure which continues to destroy Life on Earth!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rev M Perdcy</p>
	Mark Tanis	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p>

			<p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>YES! As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Be the Change?!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Robert Brown	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing</p>



			<p>Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Robert Brown</p>
Ingrid Naumann	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Ingrid Naumann
	Kate Lunceford	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Do not build a LNG facility and do not raise rates to cover any investments in that project. We must move off fossil fuels now!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Kate Lunceford</p>
	Richard Gawthrop	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Richard Gawthrop</p>
	Patricia Marks	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p>

			<p>Why should we, the taxpayers, pay these increases, so PSE can recoup costs from capital and operating investments made on behalf of customers which includes the Tacoma LNG facility.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. Patricia Marks</p>
	Rev. Amy Aspell	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." WE should NOT be fracking!! And PSE should not be raising rates for ANYONE to pay for something they should not have done to begin with. Shame!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Barbara Anderson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>PSE could reduce painful outages for its customers by using batteries, microgrids, virtual power plants, larger repair crews, more frequent tree maintenance, undergrounding power lines, and better equipment monitoring and replacement. This would reduce outages. However, PSE is not investing enough in these programs and technologies.</p> <p>Significantly raising energy bills for Washingtonians to pay for more fossil fuel infrastructure does not embody care for our communities, benefit our shared air and waters, or bring us towards a more just future.</p> <p>Please do the right thing!</p> <p>In faith, Barbara</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Barbara Anderson</p>
	Rev. Davi Weasley	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Rev. Davi Weasley
	kate nelson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>I am a Puget Sound Energy customer and have been disappointed in their new plans with the LNG facility. Their rate hike proposal is what they think they can do without blinking an eye. I do not feel they reflect their customer's feelings about this.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. kate nelson</p>
	Shannon Markley	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>

			<p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Catherine Reid-McKee	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>My religious faith and values uphold the value of this planet and all that live here. This compels me toward limiting fossil fuels in most forms as they are harming the earth and threatening existence. I want our utilities company to move to clean energy systems and move away from systems that have been proven a threat to us all.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen</p>



			<p>to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Catherine Reid-McKee</p>
Rob Klengler	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>We voluntarily pay 10% extra on our electric bill for green energy. I think it's duplicitous for PSE to take our additional payment, and then increase rates to cover development of fossil fuel expansion.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Rob Klengler</p>
	C Creager	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a customer, I vehemently oppose PSE passing on the costs of a bad investment, an investment in fossil fuels, to the customer.</p> <p>Unfortunately I cannot change power providers, so this comment is my only power. Please listen to me and the many others opposed to this.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, C Creager</p>
	Gregg Selby	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>Rate payers should not be asked to subsidize PSE’s investments in LNG facilities that are intended primarily for commercial marine use.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Gregg Selby</p>
	Dr. James Little	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>

			<p>We must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. I lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area. I want PSE to reflect the values of my community and to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. James Little</p>
	Lynn Colson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.” We have entirely electrified our home and do not want to support any further development of LNG. We would like to see further development of green energy like the solar panels on our roof. We moved from Colorado because of the health and environmental consequences of fracking and natural gas extraction. We do not support LNG development.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Lynn Colson</p>
	Jean Spohn	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jean Spohn</p>
	Steve Hansen	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>The Tacoma facility was undertaken by PSE with full knowledge of the environmental and social justice failings it entailed, and the strong opposition it faced. Customers should not be burdened with the costs.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

			<p>Sincerely, Mr. Steve Hansen</p>
	Margaret Botch	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Thank you for doing all you can to make our shared energy system more clean and just.</p> <p>Sincerely, Margaret C. Botch</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Margaret Botch</p>

	Lisa Citron	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>I oppose the proposals made by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) a nearly 20% rate increase for residential electric customers, and a 17% rate increase for residential gas customers.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lisa Citron</p>
	Kathleen Chen	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility</p>



			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Especially critical is to respect and recognize the Puyallup Tribe's court appeal to Tacoma LNG's clean air permit, as the proposed construction violates its treaty, among other problems. DO listen to these concerns, and do the right thing by heavily minimizing PSE's proposed rate increases.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathleen Chen</p>
	Sharon Wilson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As a PSE customer, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>

			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sharon Wilson</p>
	Ann Mayer	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ann Mayer</p>

Garrison Dyer	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." It's up to us to demand that PSE actually does what is right, and it's up to those of you in positions of decision-making power and influence to use those positions ethically as well. Please oppose PSE's proposed rate increases, for the benefit of our entire ecosystem.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Garrison Dyer</p>
Marcy Golde	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility</p>

			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>No! No! No! to adding fossil fuel facilities. Marcy Golde</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mrs. Marcy Golde</p>
	Sandra Shipley	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." I oppose PSE rate hikes.</p> <p>The reliability of PSE service has not improved over the past decade. I have lived on Whidbey Island for 10 years so I know this. Rate increases should be earned by improving quality of service, cleaner energy and transparency and accountability. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measure that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE should not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep Colstrip running beyond 2025. PSE should not be compensated for building projects with no clear justification, or which could be served by prudent, cost-effective clean energy alternatives. From what I can</p>

			<p>tell, they have a good PR team without really doing what they say they do.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sandra Shipley</p>
	Monica Bradley	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>How CAN it be right to raise the utility rates of our citizens to pay for this unenlightened, unwanted, climate damaging facility. <b>JUST SAY NO</b></p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Monica Bradley</p>
	Frances Blair	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>From PSE's first mention of an LNG plant on the Tiddeflats, I have been an outspoken opponent of their proposal, for all of the reasons listed below. However, PSE went ahead and did the dastardly deed anyway while waiting for the necessary approvals, which never came. They should NOT, I repeat NOT, be granted any rate increases! We the people did not want the LNG plant, and we certainly should not be the ones paying for it! Let the PSE executives and hirelings who pushed for the plant tighten their own belts. Please do not allow them to pass the costs of their malfeasance on to their customers! Customers, not shareholders, are the ones whom PSE should be serving!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

		<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Deirdre Gabbay	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I am not pleased to be asked to support the LNG facility on the Tacoma Tideflats - a project which I have long protested against (1) because of the harm it will cause to the tide flats and the people who depend on them for sustenance, (2) because it is potentially explosive and located in an area surrounded by vulnerable populations, and (3) because we need to be moving away from fossil fuels with maximum haste to avert even worse climate catastrophe than we are already experiencing.</p> <p>For these reasons I oppose this rate increase.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>

			<p>facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Deirdre Gabbay</p>
Judy Fruhbauer	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, it is wrong to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE shareholders. Supporting the Tacoma LNG facility is especially bad. I do not use gas heat, I am NOT in favor of another facility. I will be affected by the safety and health risks and climate warming emissions associated with fossil fuels. Invest in creating another alternative</p> <p>Judy Fruhbauer Bellingham WA</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judy Fruhbauer</p>



Lucy JOHNSON	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lucy JOHNSON</p>
Sylvia Haven	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I do not approve of any PSE rate increase which will go in part to support the Tacoma LNG facility! Please add my name to the throngs of Washington State citizens who are objecting to that facility</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Christopher East	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Christopher East</p>
Jared Howe	Email		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Jared Howe</p>

Victoria Poling	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Kathleen Delbocq	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>It is an injustice to create this facility and expect others to foot the bill.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Michael LeFreniere	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to this proposed increase. I have no interest in subsidizing the Tacoma LNG plant which will not benefit me whatsoever. It was built to support the LNG ships and LNG exports to China. If it passes, like many people will do, I will convert our heating systems to inexpensive Tacoma electric power and PSE can keep their climate-destroying gas.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow</p>

			<p>Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Heidi Erdmann	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mrs. Heidi Erdmann</p>
	Patrick Barredo, St James Cathedral	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility</p>

			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patrick Barredo</p>
	Dr. Richard Timmins	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I work hard to keep my energy costs down and to reduce my global warming footprint. My neighbors and I are captives to privately held PSE, and I am angry that this company would demand that I pay for their unethical and self-serving decisions. PSE's motivation is not to serve their customers but to increase profit for their investors. Do not allow this rate increase! This is evidence that public utilities are essential to protect consumers and the environment!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

			<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. Richard Timmins</p>
	Stephanie Sarver	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>This rate increase would be antithetical to efforts at curbing global heating. They owe a commitment to the public and the planet, to shift their customers away from fossil fuels toward renewable energy.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stephanie Sarver</p>



Floris Mikkelsen	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Floris Mikkelsen</p>
Sharon Cox	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel</p>

			<p>infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Sharon Cox</p>
Kathryn Jacobs	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad</p>

		<p>for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathryn Jacobs</p>
saphroniayoung@comcast.net	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life</p>

			<p>of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Andrew E Louis	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Andrew E Louis</p>
	Janice Tornow	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. If allowed to go forward, over the next three years, PSE electric rates are estimated to surge by more than 20% and gas rates by almost 17% to increase shareholder returns on the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery and other unwise investments. This is unacceptable when PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility and many customers are struggling or unable to pay their bills.</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>Residential customers should not have to reimburse PSE for the LNG facility since the main function of the refinery is to sell maritime fuel, not heat homes. PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle</p>

			<p>emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. PSE continues to build gas infrastructure while ignoring: customer preference for renewable energy, declining demand forecasts, and impacts of methane exacerbating the climate crisis.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Janice Tornow</p>
	Jamielyn Valdes	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jamielyn Valdes</p>
Roy Treadway	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Roy Treadway</p>
	Karin Carr	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>



			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Karin Carr</p>
George Pate	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>George Pate</p>
Gen Obata	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Gen Obata</p>
	Liz Bundy	Email	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed utility increases of 12% for electricity and the rate hike for natural gas. A rate increase of half this amount might be tolerable but 12% is unthinkable to be absorbed for a working class customer.</p> <p>Liz Bundy</p>
	Kathryn True	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Ms. Kathryn True
	Rachel Haxtema	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I'm appalled that the move to use LNG continues given the incredible outpouring of resistance from the Tribe and the larger community. There was a fire onboard an LNG carrying ship recently and that could have had disastrous effects for the port and our community if the LNG tanks had been compromised. I'm concerned for the health and safety of my community and I'm concerned that our Tacoma region is being treated as the dirty fuel port and that Seattle will become cleaner but Tacoma will be made to bear the effects of ongoing pollution from fossil fuels and our climate will continue to suffer our use of dirty, unsafe and unhelpful fossil fuels.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rachel Haxtema</p>

	David Ketter	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." While PSE is making an effort to increase its renewable energy portfolio its efforts to date have been insufficient to meet long term goals mandated by the state. "Doing what is right" includes closing this gap and being more transparent about how PSE will meet these goals.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. David Ketter</p>
	Jim Roberts	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly</p>

impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

			<p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Jim Roberts</p>
	Patrick BEAUDRY	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Patrick BEAUDRY</p>
	Paul Brown	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul>



			<p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Brown</p>
	Richard McCloskey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Richard McCloskey</p>
	John Evans	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of</p>

			<p>Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>John Evans</p>
	Scott Species	Email	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to</li></ul>

			<p>subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</p> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Scott Species</p>
	Lorenz Steininger	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate

			<p>increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lorenz Steininger</p>
	Laureen France	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Laureen France</p>
	Carol Scherpenisse	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should absolutely not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Carol Scherpenisse</p>
	Janice Mackanic	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p>

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Janice Mackanic</p>
	Mary Jean Coleman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>



			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mary Jean Coleman</p>
	Peter Jabin	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Peter Jabin</p>
	Katherine Bos	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Katherine Bos</p>
	Thomas Gilmore	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Thomas Gilmore</p>

Elizabeth Maupin	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." I see the devastation already being created by climate change and recognize fossil fuel use as a major contributor. I see the toll of inflation on those who have little enough already. These rate increases will bring further pain to low income families here. Please don't do this!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Elizabeth Maupin</p>
Barbara Scavezze	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Barbara Scavezze</p>
	Leslie Toy	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p>

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Leslie Toy</p>
	Donald Miller	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Donald Miller</p>
Lester Pogue	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

			Sincerely, Lester Pogue
	Rich Voget	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We seem to be at a tipping point in our democracy. To be a nation of laws, there have to be consequences for breaking laws. Puget Sound Energy started building the LNG facility without building permits. The consequence should be that they are not allowed to operate it. And certainly, they should not be allowed to raise their rates to their customers in order to pay for it.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rich Voget</p>
	Victoria Stanich	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,



			<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Victoria Stanich</p>
	Sid Olufs	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.

This entire project stinks to high heavens. Remember this is part of two projects organized by a former mayor, now member of Congress, that smoothed the path for natural gas companies to build facilities in Tacoma that were refused in places like Longview, Seattle, and Bellingham. But, NO, Tacoma bends over, backwards, to facilitate the foreign owned gas companies building their export facilities here. The Methanol Plant raised a big public ruckus, so PSE learned the lesson and decided: Just build it. Do not ask for permission, ask for forgiveness down the road.

So they built it without a good faith consultation with the tribes, and the Tacoma City Council went along with it. Let that aside, but it will be on their tombstones.

And the claim that the LNG plant was to just supply ships in the Salish Sea an alternative to bunker oil was pure rubbish. Look around the world at the other similar plants being built, like the one in Germany on the Baltic. They predicted that the LNG market is volatile and these facilities will help companies maximize their participation in the global market. Paying attention to the Ukraine war and the natural gas consequences for Germany and neighboring countries? A lot of the LNG going to Asian markets is now going to go to Northern Europe. Who is going to make up for this competition for the E. Asian consumers? The Tacoma LNG owners are feeling pretty happy these days, I imagine. They positioned themselves for exactly this scenario, and here it comes.

The disrespect for native sovereignty behind this project is one thing. The obfuscations and tall tales to justify it are another layer. The big players found a city whose political leaders bend over (backwards) for these big interests.

And now the owners of PSE want all of us natural gas users to pay more for the facility they made in this way, that they are about to engage in the world market, and make astounding profits. They want more profit from us.

The proposed rate increases are an abomination. a cynical ploy to put yet another deal over on a weak local political system.

I dissent.

We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.

It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sid Olufs</p>
	Ron Shutter	Email	<p>No to the PSE extra increase. Reckless spending MUST stop.....</p> <p>Regards, Ron Shutter Concerned AND becoming active citizen of Renton</p>
	Ellen Murphy	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Mrs.. Ellen Murphy
	Denice Jentlie	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Concerned home owner in 98405,</p>

			Denice Jentlie
	Kelsey Herschberger	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Kelsey Herschberger</p>
	Terrill Saunders	Email	<p>PSE is proposing an almost 10% rate increase. PSE has made good profits and I don’t see reason to justify this rate increase. Inflation is at 9% and the public can’t afford more increases going into winter.Sincerely,        Terrill Saunders Ferndale, WA</p>
	Dr. David Hallowell	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the</p>

			<p>Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. David Hallowell</p>
	Eva Bowen	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Eva Bowen</p>
	Candyce Rennegarbe	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my use reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." No rate increases and stop!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>

			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Candyce Rennegarbe</p>
	Demian	Email	<p>Greetings</p> <p>I urge the UTC to reject any PSE rate increases that support expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure or that infringes on native rights or sovereignty such as the Tacoma LBG facility.</p> <p>Thank you Demian</p>
	Derek Benedict	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>



			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Derek Benedict</p>
Kathy McFall-Butler	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kathy McFall-Butler</p>
haleyballast@gmail.com	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Haley Ballast</p>
Lucia Faithfull	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Lucia Faithfull</p>
	Signe Roscoe	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I am a PSE customer and I am making plans to move away from Natural Gas in favor of (eventually) more green electricity. PSE's rate increase request is not only WRONG for the environment but also not following</p>

			<p>science that points to a need to move away from Natural Gas. Instead of INVESTING MORE in fossil fuel, PSE should follow their stated ethic of "doing what is right" and begin a comprehensive plan to divest of natural gas.</p> <p>The time is NOW to move towards a more clean and just energy system. Also, I understand that the bulk of the increased production that the rate hikes are aimed at recouping are primarily going to INDUSTRY. As a private citizen and customer, I protest paying for industry on the backs of the citizenry.</p> <p>So please dial way back their rate increase request in an incentive to move them toward divestiture and toward a more ethical and green business plan.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Signe Roscoe</p>
	Barbara Bernstein	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p>

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Barbara Bernstein</p>
	Suzanne Scollon	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Suzanne Scollon 1510 Bismark Ln</p>
Shelly Ackerman	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person with a heart and a brain, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We know that fracked gas has a high and long lasting environmental cost and that significantly raising energy bills for Washingtonians to pay for more fossil fuel infrastructure does not care for our communities, benefit our shared air and waters, or bring us towards a more just future.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen</p>

			<p>to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Shelly Ackerman</p>
Kristofer Nystrom	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Kristofer Nystrom</p>
	<p>Nancy Shimeall</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>We must move towards a more clean and just energy system for the sake of our health, our economy, and the world's natural resources. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Ms. Nancy Shimeall</p>
	<p>Ranell Nystrom</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas</p>



			<p>(LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ranell Nystrom</p>
	O'Neill Louchard	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>

			<p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. O’Neill Louchard</p>
	Hannah Lemke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Hannah Lemke</p>
	Christopher Buckley	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen</p>

			<p>to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Christopher Buckley</p>
Margaret LovellFord	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>I understand why the state of Washington initiated efforts to lower our carbon production. I also know that it may cost me more to heat my home, but I do not think that I should have to pay more because Puget sound energy wants to be selling fuel to ships.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Margaret LovellFord</p>
Amy Hitchens	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith and a pastor of a church that takes climate justice seriously, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. Our church is considering becoming a Climate Justice Church. Until we can afford solar panels, we are dependent on what PSE offers in utilities.</p> <p>As a homeowner, I am also in Puget Sound Energy's service area. I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

			Sincerely, Ms. Amy Hitchens
	Julia Buck	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments, including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for disregarding the legal process and ignoring concerns from community members.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. It threatens traditional fishing and gathering practices on the Tacoma tide flats, which is protected under the Medicine Creek Treaty. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women; 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects; 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Julia Buck
	dbain@gmavt.net	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

	Nola Thury	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Nola Thury</p>



	Elizabeth Cutter	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Elizabeth Cutter</p>
	Russell Burke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

			<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Russell Burke</p>
	Susie MacGregor	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

			<p>PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mx. Susie MacGregor</p>
	Mary Paynter	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p>

			<p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Mary Paynter</p>
	Devon Johnson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a homeowner and customer of Puget Sound Energy, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." To me, this means PSE should not be financially rewarded for performing project work inconsistent with the interests of its customers. As a Washingtonian with a deep connection to our natural environment, I urge you to reconsider the proposed electricity rate increase, and instead allow payments from customers to fund projects that transition our region towards cleaner energy production.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Devon Johnson</p>
	Alexis Heise	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Alexis Heise</p>
	Anna Dyer	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anna Dyer</p>

	Phil Shephard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Phil Shephard</p>
	Christopher Murphy	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

		<p>Prior to building PSE promised no rate increase for refinery, now they want the customers to pay for their building. PSE said LNG was cleaner than bunker fuel, we now know that that is a lie and that getting LNG to the end consumer releases very large amounts of methane, one of the very worst greenhouse gases. We also know that burning LNG creates much smaller by products that directly attack our upper atmosphere and is equivalent in overall damage to be the same as burning coal and much worse than ships that burn bunker fuel and have scrubbers. Say no to PSE and stop the lies about LNG is a cleaner, greener energy source.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--



			Christopher Murphy
Brian Rulifson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brian Rulifson</p>	
Evan Fulmer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began</p>	

			<p>construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Evan Fulmer</p>
	Ethan Teed	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." We certainly shouldn't be paying to increase our use of fossil fuels that we should not be utilizing anyway.</p>

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ethan Teed</p>
	Jacqueline Heise	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>

			<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Jacqueline Heise</p>
	Anne Dickerson	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>

			<p>facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anne Dickerson</p>
Carl Woestwin	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Carl Woestwin</p>
Hannah Walters	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p>

			<p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Hannah Walters</p>
	Ann Kilby	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility</p>

			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms Ann Kilby</p>
Steven Schultz	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth</p>

			<p>defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Steven Schultz</p>
	b_donnell@msn.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p>



		<p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Judy Wiggins Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims,</p>

			<p>the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Judy Wiggins</p>
Farley Bartelmes	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Farley Bartelmes</p>
BONNIE REEVES	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p>

			<p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>BONNIE REEVES</p>
lee johnson	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both</p>

			<p>state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>lee johnson</p>
	lmichon@rog ers.com	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p>

			<p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
T. DeMaio	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Sincerely, Prof. T. DeMaio
michael799@optonline.net	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

	J Elmer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings. Methane emissions are much worse for greenhouse warming than carbon pollution. Both should be restricted.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>



			J Elmer
	Ken Steinman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Ken Steinman</p>

Marjorie Browning	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Marjorie Browning</p>
Elly Claus-McGahan	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,

			<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE built the LNG plant with the stated intention of providing maritime fuel. The plant was built over strong opposition from many in the community because of its location and the danger it presents to the community should there be an earthquake or an explosion. The fuel is proposed as "clean" is not clean as the amount of methane leakage in its production is substantial and methane is a potent GHG. PSE sidestepped proper permitting procedure when building the plant and has had legal challenges because of it. As a fossil fuel company it has sufficient legal council and funding to withstand most legal challenges. But the bottom line as a gas customer, is that I do not want to pay for the plant's debt, or for anything related to the LNG plant. The plant is not and was not needed by PSE's residential customers. We should not be on the hook for paying for it; that should be the responsibility of PSE's maritime customers or through PSE's profits, should it not have maritime customers.</p> <p>PSE faces future challenges in potentially being stuck with stranded assets as WA state continues to push forward on building electrification at the state level and by choice of its residents. PSE needs to adapt and do more to develop its renewable energy resources. But that is not what is under discussion here. PSE is seeking rate increases to pay for LNG debt from its residential customers. The only rate increases that should be levied on residential customers are those directly related to production and delivery of gas to its residential customers. Those rate increases should be in line with what other gas utilities are doing. Please study the rate increase PSE is asking for carefully, and please do not allow PSE to shift the costs of the LNG plant onto its residential customers.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Elly Claus-McGahan</p>
	Lisa Marcus	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is not serving us with its continuing bad investments in dirty energy, and should not be paid to do it. Specifically, PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked "natural" gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE's decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a</p>

		<p>focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Thank you for your careful assessment of this harmful matter.</p> <p>Lisa Marcus</p>
	Christina Manetti	Email <p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice</p>

			<p>has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Christina Manetti</p>
	Margaret L Battisti	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Margaret L Battisti</p>
M B	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>PSE built a dangerous bomb in our backyard. Similar such facilities have destroyed buildings many miles away.</p> <p>Now PSE wants to raise residential electric and gas rates.</p> <p>PSE should be prosecuted, not rewarded, and the bomb should be removed.</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>M B</p>
James Wesley	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p>

			<p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission needs to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Moreover, anything Bob Ferguson’s shop opposes, I oppose. He looks out for his constituents interests and these dockets are NOT supported by our AG’s Office.</p> <p>James Wesley</p>
	Sarah Randolph	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>My household is working to go fully electric as a result of PSE's irresponsible actions. This rate hike is just the latest insult to injury. Many homeowners feel exactly the same as I do. PSE needs to get in the renewable energy game or see their business fail.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p>

			<p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>Sarah Randolph</p> <p>Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
Peter Weston	Email		<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p>



			<p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>You built a major LNG facility on indigenous people's lands. Without proper permitting to make more money for its shareholders. To sell LNG to shipping companies. We absolutely need to rethink how we do business on a global scale. We need to keep Oil Coal and Gas in the ground to minimize the results of climate chaos. Sea level will go up, it is baked into the environment now and forever more. Let's get some renewables into the portfolio of PSE.</p> <p>Peter Weston</p>
	TIFFANY MENDOZA	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this</p>

			<p>corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p> <p>TIFFANY MENDOZA</p>
	Gerald Iyall	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects.</p>

			<p>Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Gerald Iyall</p>
	Eileen La Bouve	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s</p>

			<p>use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Eileen La Bouve</p>
Joyce Oldoski	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p> <p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>

			Joyce Oldoski
	Querido Galdo	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p> <p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility’s main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility’s use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public’s interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p> <p>Querido Galdo</p>

	blue@everblu e.info	Email	<p>Puget Sound Energy is proposing to increase residential rate hikes, and at the same time, invest heavily in the the construction of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery, which will primarily support maritime shipping; both of these things individually are problematic (contributing to the cost of living crisis and continuing to invest in fossil fuel infrastructure), but put together, they are tragic.</p> <p>Please do not allow a for-profit corporation to use the shield of "increasing costs" as cover to invest in dirty infrastructure completely unrelated to providing energy for local homes.</p> <p>According to the Attorney General of Washington, PSE lied during the permitting process and lied during the DSEIS (1). They've continually bullied native tribes, and now want to charge more to cover the costs of their malfeseance and planned environmental harm. Don't let them get away with this.</p> <p>Citation:</p> <p>(1):  <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fnativedailynetwork.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2020%2F07%2FCEP-comment-letter-on-PSCAA-Tacoma-LNG-draft-SEIS.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C47519722596d4089eb7f08da9fcde631%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C637998004221067750%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sddata=IhdTogRslsaJ9QI2ddbMPtAaQydToTenB9kitkbc2N8%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fnativedailynetwork.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2020%2F07%2FCEP-comment-letter-on-PSCAA-Tacoma-LNG-draft-SEIS.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C47519722596d4089eb7f08da9fcde631%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C637998004221067750%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sddata=IhdTogRslsaJ9QI2ddbMPtAaQydToTenB9kitkbc2N8%3D&amp;reserved=0</a></p>
	Dawn McKeehan	Email	<p>I have lived in Bellevue for 39 years and I cannot afford to pay current prices for gas and electricity at the current rates. I certainly cannot pay more. I object to any rate increases!!!!</p> <p>Dawn McKeehan</p>
	Debbie Shapiro	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>Do not raise the rates!!</p>

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Debbie Shapiro</p>
	Susie MacGregor	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Devon Johnson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>	
Anna Dyer	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p>	



			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Leslie Marshall	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

	Lisa Citron	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>It's personal. For every. single. person. It's personal.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Richard Johnson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p>

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Ken Hardesty	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

	Leah Rapalee	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Stephanie Bell	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Gayla Soldano	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Dr. Dorothy Jordan	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

			<p>PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." This means not continuing to support fossil fuel projects, especially ones that negatively impact the surrounding community.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Deborah Hagen-Lukens	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Climate change will mandate we abandon fossil fuel sooner rather than later. PSE's Tacoma LNG facility should never have been approved, particularly after the corners PSE cut to begin the project. Rate payers should not suffer the consequences of PSE's poor decision making.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Deborah Woolley	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a lifelong resident of Washington state, I am proud to see my state taking a leadership role in responding to climate change, and I want to see my state's utility companies recognizing the urgency of the situation by renouncing all new fossil fuel projects and halting any ongoing fossil fuel projects such as the LNG facility. PSE customers should not have to pay for what was a wrong decision on the part of PSE.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Jim Irby	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the</p>

			<p>Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Nancy Hausauer	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I am a PSE customer. I am writing to ask you not to approve a rate increase for PSE to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes investments in fracked “natural” gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE’s decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more</p>



		<p>methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p>
	Diana Owens E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>i would be considered an elderly person, who lives on a fixed income of \$2,000.00 + a month. I have lived in my home for fifty plus years. Currently, I am on the monthly pay schedule for my utilities. As it stands, I paid over three hundred dollars a month for utilities. My son, who live on Hilltop, and disabled pays more, plus he has gas. I can't image how much he will have to pay? I am concerned what this plan will do to the environment, as well as the hardship it will put on people, who can't afford the increase of cost of heating and lighting our homes. I even checked into putting up solar panels on my roof, very expensive as well. What about the average person, trying to live. When is corporate profits enough, and consideration of the average people considered! It is bad enough, the building of high raise apartments in Tacoma, that only a few people can afford. And others have to go unhoused or live in our cars. When will the greed stop, and people be more considerate of the least of these?</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

			<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Ron DiGiacomo	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Dr. Kevin O'Brien	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean</p>

			<p>and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Joshua Stromberg-Wojcik	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. Fracked gas is immoral and unconscionable. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p>

			<p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Karen Dalenius	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Kirsten Pangelinan	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. I adamantly oppose energy rate increases to help pay for fracking.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel</p>

			<p>infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Larry Cruse	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>

	Ted Brookes	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>I believe the proposed PSE rate hikes to support the construction of the Tacoma LNG facility are totally inconsistent with the current plan and policies of the state legislature and Governor Inslee to achieve significant reductions in fossil fuel sources by 2030. It is also in conflict with the desires and aspirations of the citizens of western Washington to have clean air, reduced dependence on fossil fuels, and a reduction in green house gases during the next decade. Asking the citizens of WA to pay for the LNG project, something they really do not want and will not benefit from is a slap in the face. If PSE was asking me and my fellow citizens to support the building of a Solar Panel farm vice a LNG facility I would be the first to sign on. Let’s be real and disapprove of PSEs proposal.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Lu Hamacek	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>

			<p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Anne Miller	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, Lake Hills Transmission Line, or Energize Eastside. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE prioritizes dangerous investments in fracked "natural" gas and costly unnecessary infrastructure projects. Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, and demand response. These actions would accelerate the transition to clean energy, improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE's decisions are influenced by their strong ties with the fossil gas industry and a focus on shareholder profits. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) needs to protect the interests of residential customers, who have no choice but to use the services monopolized by this corporation.</p> <p>The UTC looks out for customers by approving investments with the "lowest cost". When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <p>When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions should be considered. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts,</p>

			<p>worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events for our region and planet should be included.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE should also not continue to use ratepayer funds to keep the Colstrip coal-fired power plant running beyond 2025. The costs of mining, transporting and using coal create negative impacts on human health, water quality, and our climate. These costs are unacceptable when investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are available instead.</p>
Dr. Linda Hood	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>



Dianne Shiner	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Colleen Paul	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Building this LNG facility over the objections of the community and in violation of the tribe's sovereignty is wrong on so many levels, and I oppose any increase in rates.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Jeneva Apolito	E-mail		<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I completely oppose raising our rates to pay for infrastructure that we do not want, that will in no way benefit us, and that may even harm our community and environment. I want no part in your pipeline, I do not want want the LNG plant installed down the road from my family and children and I certainly do not want to pay 20% more for getting this shoved down our throats. You should not raise the rates on consumers for something that only benefits you and that we here in East Tacoma have opposed from day 1. We do not want this plant here on our doorstep, and given what is happening with our climate, we should not be paying for this anywhere. I would be fine with a rate hike for investments in green energy that could eventually power our community safely and cheaply for years but this LNG plant spits in the face of East Tacomans and our children.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen</p>

			<p>to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Diane Shaughnessy	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Lorraine Johnson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility</p>

			<p>reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Jenna Carodiskey-Wiebe	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>

			facilities like Tacoma LNG.
	Robert Jensen	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Herbert Hethcote	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my Unitarian Universalist values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Gena De Pateico	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Nancy Vandenburg	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p>

			<p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, it is important to me that I do what I can to care for all of creation. Businesses also have an obligation to care for creation and our communities, and building the Tacoma LNG facility is certainly not part of building a green and healthy energy system. As a PSE customer, it is a slap in the face to me to be asked to pay more on my bill to pay for a facility that I believe is unjust and that clearly will worsen climate change.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Carol Kindt	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person who spent 5 years attending every kind of government hearing opposing this I’ll-conceived project, there is no way in hell that I would think giving PSE, which the LNG plant is not even operated locally but by foreign investment companies (plural) any rate increase to in any way subsidize its existence. I am outraged to say the least that this is even a proposal. Tell Tacoma city council (past and present) and PSCAA to subsidize it out of their own paychecks since they were the entities responsible for faulty EIS, SEIS, and other green-lighted procedural problems that exempted PSE from scrutiny that even a homeowner would have been subjected to in order to build a fence. Shame on all of you.</p>

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Kristen Pool	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As human living on earth, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>I just put solar panels on my roof to help support our environment- and I am only 1 person - not a corporation! You can do better</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>



			facilities like Tacoma LNG.
Jillian Froebe	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>	
Elizabeth Kerwin	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>	

			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Michael Regan	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>There are many alternatives PSE should be pursuing. Offshore wind, geothermal, solar. It;s irresponsible of them to continue with fossil fuels to the detriment of all.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>

			facilities like Tacoma LNG.
Marian Schwartz	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I am totally opposed this project. Considering global climate change, we should be doing everything possible to reduce our use of fossil fuels, and switch to clean, renewable energy resources.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG</p>	
Debby Felnagle	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right.”</p>	

			<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Roberta Pinson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>Why in the world would you even consider fracking in an earthquake prone part of the country? Please refer to the state of OK to become aware of the huge increase of earthquakes in the area where fracking is taking place.</p> <p>Roberta Pinson</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health</p>

			<p>risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Jamie Donaldson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I want to be part of the climate solution.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>	
Laureen France	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose all rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential electric rates by more than 20% during the next three years, and residential gas rates by almost 17%. This is unacceptable. PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility with many customers struggling or unable to pay their bills. Shareholder profits should not come before basic human needs.</p>	

			<p>Investments have not demonstrated an increase in reliability or quality of service for PSE residential customers despite continued rate increases. Frequency and duration of power outages vary by area creating inequities.</p> <p>PSE's proposed rate increase is unprecedented in its scale and scope. They are largely seeking compensation for infrastructure projects completed in the past, currently being built, and unspecified, incomplete projects. Many of the past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Residential Customers should not have to pay for infrastructure that they will likely never use. The Tacoma LNG facility's main purpose is supplying gas to maritime customers as shipping fuel. PSE claims the facility will also be a backup power supply on a few of the coldest days of the year when demand is the highest. This assertion ignores the trend that demand is actually decreasing due to energy efficiency, and customer preference for renewable sources. Even if the backup was used, it would only account for less than 2% of the facility's use over the life of the lease, yet PSE is looking for reimbursement on almost half of the construction costs. This is not in the public's interest and the Utilities and Transportation Commission need to deny all reimbursement for this facility.</p> <p>Continuing to build or expand fossil fuel infrastructure despite dire warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rapidly move away from these polluting sources is unacceptable. The impacts of exacerbating the climate crisis will fall hardest on Black, Brown and Indigenous families, low-income households. Please deny these rate increases and be part of a more equitable, healthy, and just future.</p>
	Christine Parke	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. Puget Sound Energy must really live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe</p>

			<p>and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Amara Oden	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	William Elliott Burk	E-mail	<p>Please grant a 10% or more electric rate discount on the PSE bill for those that are poor. Showing an EBT card at the PSE office in Olympia should be enough documentation to verify poverty.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

			Grace, Respect, Love Always in Jesus,
	Tika Bordelon	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Dorothy Wayne	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG</p>



			<p>facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Lowell Park	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Robin Moore	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p>

Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

Here are the facts:

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon

			<p>dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Betsy Schultz	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined</li></ul>

			<p>vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Noel Allen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more</li></ul>

cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.

- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.

	Stuart Blum	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon</li></ul>
--	-------------	--------	---

			<p>dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Deborah David	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly</li></ul>

			<p>explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Jeff Petroskie	E-mail	At today's prices for all goods and services we can't afford any more cost increases !
	Nancy Atwood	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility company reflect my values and to "do what is right."</p>



		<p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Jim Roberts	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-</li></ul>

			<p>forming volatile organic compounds; • The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Anne Roda	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p>

This facility is not needed:

- PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.
- PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.
- The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.

This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:

- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;
- The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.
- This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk

This facility harms our climate:

- There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.
- LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.
- As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.
- Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.

To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms

			highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.
Joyce Grajczyk	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition</li></ul>	

			<p>to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Tina Langley	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel</p>

			facilities like Tacoma LNG.
Peter Kowalczyk	E-mail	Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,  Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.  Here are the facts:  This facility is not needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> This facility harms our climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition</li></ul>	

			<p>to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Lynn Graham	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Annemarie Dooley	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive a rate increase</p> <p>PSE sacrifices the health and lives of Americans by its use of fracked "natural" gas. Children living less than 2km from a fracked gas well have 200% increased odds of developing leukemia. This company cannot be rewarded for this so called "investment"</p> <p>Instead, they should be investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates,</p>



			and demand response. Wanting to build more gas infrastructure will worsen our climate breakdown.
	Scott Species	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition</li></ul>

			<p>to a low-carbon economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	David Luxem	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul>

			<p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Norma Ramirez	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>Opposing PSE rate increases - dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p>

As a customer of PSE, I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.

We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.

It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.

Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.

Sincerely,  
Norma Ramirez

We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.

It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.

Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel

			facilities like Tacoma LNG
	John Merrill	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE).</p> <p>However, the lack of the Commission's ability to force PSE and other WA utilities to prove that new infrastructure is actually needed and in the best interests of rate payers is disturbing. PSE did not prove the need for either the Tacoma LNG facility or its so-called Energize Eastside transmission line. Further, both have a high likelihood of becoming stranded assets well before their useful life is ended, further burdening ratepayers.</p> <p>The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how an energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility's cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples' homes.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tideflats area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Development of the Tacoma LNG facility the project would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Kathy Albert	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl, and Doumit,</p> <p>Thank you for your work to provide oversight and accountability to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The record is clear that this facility is not needed to provide gas utility service to ratepayers, has direct and unacceptable impact to the Puyallup Tribe, has unacceptable environmental justice impacts, is a net contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and sets a bad precedent for how energy facilities can greenwash projects. To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don't have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Here are the facts:</p> <p>This facility is not needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE has yet to prove this facility is needed – demand for gas utility service will continue to decline as more cities in Washington ban new gas utility connections in an effort to combat climate change.</li></ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSE represented during its environmental review that only 1% or 2% of the total gas produced at the facility will be used to benefit ratepayers. Yet, they want to charge ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility. It is unfair to charge ratepayers for such a significant proportion of the facility’s cost, when they will barely benefit at all from its use.</li><li>• The main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels. Ratepayers should not be forced to subsidize a fueling facility for marine ships.</li></ul> <p>This facility has unacceptable environmental justice impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has known air pollutants, ranging from greenhouse gas methane and smog-forming volatile organic compounds;</li><li>• The Tacoma LNG Facility can store large quantities of highly explosive fuels, such as propane and butane, near densely populated urban neighborhoods, which are adjacent to the Port of Tacoma. This elevates risks and threats of disaster scenarios, such as an unconfined vapor cloud explosion within blocks from peoples’ homes.</li><li>• This highly polluting, and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, schools, churches and daycare facilities, as well as the thousands of people who live and work in and around the Port and Tidelands area—and would put this disproportionately impacted community at even greater risk</li></ul> <p>This facility harms our climate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a broad scientific and policy consensus that GHG emissions must be radically reduced over the next few decades to avoid catastrophe. Developing the Tacoma LNG facility would generate large amounts of GHGs for decades, undermining state and agency climate goals and hindering the transition to a low-carbon economy.</li><li>• LNG is a fossil fuel composed primarily of methane. When burned for fuel, methane releases carbon dioxide, the primary contributor to global climate change, and when methane escapes into the atmosphere uncombusted, it is a highly potent GHG in its own right, more than 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.</li><li>• As built, the Tacoma LNG facility would emit approximately the same amount of GHG pollution as driving 149,000 gasoline powered cars annually.</li><li>• Allowing PSE to recover costs for the facility would encourage the company to promote continued growth in the sale and use of fracked gas, a fossil fuel, by marine vessel customers and transportation. Doing so would exacerbate climate harms and contribute to climate catastrophe.</li></ul> <p>To this end, I urge you to deny prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, to ensure that ratepayers don’t have to pay for this expensive, and poorly conceived project that harms the planet and disproportionately harms highly impacted and vulnerable communities that live near the Port of Tacoma.</p>
	Broehe Karpenko	E-mail	Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,

I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.

As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."

As a person who is also of science, I believe the biologists and ecologists who tell us that our species does not exist in a vacuum, we rely on the entire web of life.

We have the power to account for the harm we've done to the planet, other species, and to our own survival.

We have the power to to turn toward systems that reduce and mitigate the harm we've caused and to align with forces of nature, of well being, of healing and balance.

Mars won't scoop up our grandchildren. We need to eliminate dangerous modes of energy delivery NOW.

We need to invest in long term energy solutions.

We need to restore habitats, our place in the web, and Earth's capacity to provide for our children's children.

We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.

It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.

Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.



Glen Anderson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I VERY STRONGLY OBJECT to LNG and other abuses to the environment and climate!!!!!!</p> <p>Planet Earth URGENTLY NEEDS TO REVERSE DAMAGE tot he environment and climate!!!!!!!</p> <p>I've lived in Puget Sound all of my 73 years.</p> <p>PLEASE PREVENT Puget Sound Energy from HURTING Planet Earth and ripping off customers in order to fund their LNG facility in Tacoma!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>I IMPLORE the WUTC to SERVE THE BROAD PUBLIC INTEREST !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
Rick Eggerth	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for</p>

			<p>PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right," not what profits its shareholders and management.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	Michael Lefreniere	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I agree with the WA State Attorney General and the WA Clean Energy Coalition ... this rate increase should be denied. The public should not have to subsidize the Tacoma LNG project, which is clearly intended to profit PSE in serving the maritime industry. This is clearly the socialization of the costs of production. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for more and more fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Phil Brooke	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to</p>

			<p>consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.          Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.          PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.          This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.          We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	Darlyn Delboca	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED COMMENT***
	Kim & Steve McCool	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED COMMENT***
	Marna Leistikio	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS***
	Norma J. Esperance	E-mail	<p>Heat is a necessity, heat is a basic need, heat should be affordable to ALL RESIDENTS. A rate increase at this time is making heat UNAFFORDABLE TO ALL.          Please reconsider the rate hike for gas and electric. Don't make people choose between heat or food, heat or medication, heat or rent, heat or homelessness. I won't even get into what it would do to seniors, including low income seniors with their reduced rate.          Thank you,</p>
	Julie Moylan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067          The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics.</p>

			<p>The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE’s claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility’s use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p>
	<p>MARGRET GRAHAM-JACOB</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>I do not support PSE proposed rate increase for 2023 through 2026. It is exorbitant and greedy. One reason they gave for rate hike included in my electric bill was "to increase PSE’s authorized return on equity from 9.4 to 9.9%". It sounds to me like it's all about profit. As a public utility service PSE must be fair in its pricing and this is just too much. I would support a more reasonable increase spread out over several years. I am on SSDI and can barely afford my electric bill as it is currently.</p> <p>Respectfully,      MARGRET GRAHAM-JACOB</p>
	<p>Diana Hemi</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,      Puget Sound Energy (PSE) customers should not be forced to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) refinery or any other fossil fuel investments including the Colestrip coal-fired power plant with a rate increase. Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits in court for this controversial refinery. The only reason the facility is fully constructed prior to these court proceedings is because PSE began construction two years prior to obtaining proper permits. They should not be rewarded for their bully tactics. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in the NW Detention Center. This injustice has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. In order to stop the cycle of systemic</p>

			<p>environmental racism, governing bodies like the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) need to consider impacts to overburdened communities in their decision making.</p> <p>Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the following additional costs: 1) human costs such as violations of Indigenous sovereignty and increases in cases of Missing &amp; Murdered Indigenous Women 2) health costs to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects 3) environmental costs such as poisoned water tables, earthquakes, and destruction of habitat.</p> <p>PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping. Studies show that LNG is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted. Regardless of PSE's claims, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be the burden of residential customers. Over the life of the lease, high-demand peak shaving for residential customers only accounts for about 2% of the facility's use. A rate increase for these purposes is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of gas heating. Both state and local government regulations are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>We can no longer ignore the warnings about methane by the International Panel on Climate Change. The UTC should stop reimbursing Puget Sound Energy and other utilities for fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>Diana Hemi  dihemmi@hotmail.com</p>
	Kathleen and Vernone Sparkes	E-mail	<p>In reference to the above docket relating to PSE request for raising costs to consumers: We are using PSE for electricity only and are supportive of PSE's net-zero fossil fuel goals. We have been changing our household energy needs as much as we can to electric, rather than gas, and have purchased an electric vehicle, charging at home. Thus, our electric bill will increase. We can handle that increase at the present rate. We do not support an increase in cost per kWh if it mainly benefits shareholders, i.e., raises dividends. If the increased revenues were to be spent on developing more renewable energy sources, we would support an increase.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kathleen and Vernone Sparkes</p>
	Wolf	Web	<p>The proposed rate increases are both too high and too abrupt, with a double-digit hike hitting in the first year.</p>
	Vanessa LaValle	Web	<p>They want to raise rates and are proposing a +13% increase. They have made upgrades so it states that they are increasing their profit margin. All that has increased for families like mine is the cost of everything. PSE is always suppressing the occasional campaign for public utility district ownership by saying they keep rates lower, more competitive and make more frequent upgrades. They make a few upgrades and want to turn a profit on consumers. This is a utility company we have no other options so this should be illegal.</p> <p>Additionally, power goes out in Olympia all the time, both at my work (retail) and at home - summer, fall, winter and spring. My service has not improved how can I be asked to spend more?</p>

	Jane Hudson	Web	<p>I understand that everything is being effected by the current economy but at 13% increase is going to hurt so many in fixed incomes and when costs go down the rates will not be adjusted back down. A 13% increase is beyond inflation rates and can't be sustained by many consumers. PSE should look at other ways to cut costs in upper management rather than pass it in to customers at this exorbitant increase!</p>
	Rosella Cleavinger	Web	<p>*Comments typed verbatim at request of customer by Sam Cooper per call to Consumer Protection line* I am 94 years old and a new widow with enough bills to worry about without worrying about a higher power bill. Don't have much money and need to watch every penny, and that is an awful big raise.</p>
	Richard Sanford	Web	<p>PSE's requested rate increases over the next three years are extreme. In particular, the disproportionately high weighting in 2023 would shock families already struggling to keep up with the highest inflation rates in 40 years.</p> <p>Please restrict or at last rebalance these increases so that households can afford to stay in their homes.</p>
	Olga Gosman	Web	<p>Please reject this request from PSE for a number of reasons. Starting from the fact that this project has been strongly opposed by the residents of the communities which are now going to be negatively impacted by this project. Installation of these new power lines structures is not needed by our communities. There were other business reasons for PSE to push it onto local residents. Making these communities to pay for this terrible project would be adding insult to injury! Since PSE had those other business benefits out of this project they shall use those benefits for paying the cost of it and not imposing rate hike on the residents who did not want and do not need this project. It will also cause extra hardship when the cost of other really necessary items is rapidly growing.</p> <p>Thank you for representing and protecting public interests!</p>
	Cliff Hanks	Web	<p>Docket UE-220066 and UG-220067. I don't know the differences between utility companies, but I did look at the City of Seattle for a comparison. For 2022-2025, they are approved to increase rates by 10.6%, while PSE is seeking a 17.18% increase for electricity for the same period.</p> <p>They state that some of their reasons for a rate increase are to decarbonize its energy systems. As they stated, this is a state mandate. This is an increased, unfunded cost imposed by the legislature and I feel it should be paid from the excess revenue collected by Washington State and not paid by ratepayers who have no say in the matter.</p> <p>Also, they seek to increase their ROE by .5%. According to SPGlobal.com, the average ROE for utilities in 2020 was 9.47%. I ask that you keep PSE's ROE at 9.4% and not increase it to 9.9%, especially during a time of high inflation where ratepayers are struggling to keep up with costs.</p> <p>I would hope that maintaining the ROE rate and not allowing decarbonization cost increases would keep the rate increase to about 10.6%.</p>

	larry greenwood	Web	No more money grabs.
	CHARLES D SCOTTIE	Web	<p>Docket UE-220066</p> <p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:</p> <p>Last Spring, I and many of my neighbors had our meters replaced by PSE resulting in most of our bills going up by as much as seventy percent (70%) or more. Many of us were told by PSE that this was because of weather and the fact that the new meters are “more accurate”.</p> <p>I strongly urge that the increases in revenue which PSE experienced as a result of the “more accurate” meters be considered while contemplating the requested rate increases proposed in the above mentioned Docket. I further urge that the UTC either reduce any actual increase considerably or, more preferably, delay any increases for a year in order to more fully utilize the “more accurate” meters in their considerations.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention in this matter.</p> <p>Charles D. Scottie</p>
	Violet Abing	Web	<p>First of all, this is a terrific company, they do a great job. However, the suggested rate hike seems to be a little steep in today's financial crisis. It is my opinion that many will be hard pressed to afford such an increase with everything else so high. Please consider a plan that has less impact on us retirees and low income. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns and opinion.</p>
	Sandra Grace	Web	<p>This project is incomplete. PSE is erecting Energize Eastside poles in Renton and South Bellevue, but construction in Newcastle has not begun, and hearings for the North Bellevue permit have not been announced. Why should I pay PSE more on my electric bill for infrastructure of which the total cost is still unknown and the need has not been verified. Really we are being asked to fund close to \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of this project. There is not enough data to support this project and the poles are outrageous. Whoever is involved in this project should have these poles put in their back yards and their children/grandchildren's schools. Use your profits to recoup money for this project.</p>
	Julian Pietras	Web	<p>A 16% or thereabouts increase during the next year (2023) is exceedingly high given the current status of the economy. For senior citizens on a fixed income during these years it is difficult to consider such an increase. There is no indication of options by PSE nor what capital and operating investments have been made which positively affect electrical continuity during inclement weather.</p>
	Jonathan Shakes	Web	<p>I am opposed to PSE's requested rate increases because 1) The Attorney General believes they are too high, 2) The request includes an increase in PSE's authorized return on equity without any justification that I can</p>

			find, 3) The request comes without any reasonably available and understandable documentation explaining the methodology for calculating the increase. On this last point -- the lack of a reasonably available explanation of the methodology used to calculate the increase -- I hold the WUTC at fault for failing to ensure the interested public has a path to understanding what this public utility is up to. I suspect the information is out there somewhere, if I invested several hours to find and interpret it, but that's not good enough. Without any clear and concise and prominently posted justifications available for rate increases, all we can expect to hear from the public is a complaint of, "gee, I don't want to pay more for utilities" which will likely be dismissed as coming from an uninformed source. And if so, the WUTC's reaction should be to better inform the public that it is serving.
	Kim Boggs	Web	PSE is requesting to raise rates substantially, many families are still recovering from turmoil in our nation/state and this is not the time to raise rates substantially. My hope that this is taken into consideration.
	Dennis Franco	Web	All of our utilities have been or are going to increase. Please consider us who are on fixed income and disabled. I am a disabled veteran who is not poor enough to receive any benefits or tax breaks, and is still on a fixed income who is struggling to make ends meet. With all this inflation we are relying on credit while utility and oil companies are making record profits. These companies need to suck up and tighten the belt like all of us. Not fair! please do something, we are eventually being forced out of the area and have to cut back to by-weekly pick up for trash. We already compost and are energy pinchers all around
	Deborah Kasinger	Web	13.59% increase in 2023 is too much! Many can barely afford the current rates. Why not approve a smaller amount that won't be so hard like 2-3% cost of everything is high and it is creating a homeless situation for many. Please reconsider!
	crystal pierce	Web	At this time when families are struggling to buy food, pay for medical care and increased housing and gas prices this rate change is going to really going to hurt! Electric/gas are a necessity and should be affordable! If your rates have gone up, perhaps the government could tax the rich and corporations to subsidize pricing because putting this price hike on our poorer citizens is cruel.
	Dave Korkowski	Web	Once again this utility is requesting rate increases that far exceed the CPI changes. These should be trimmed. Furthermore, the structure of whatever increases are approved should DECREASE the fixed monthly charges (for gas hook-up and line maintenance) and increase the charge per "therm." Making this change would provide an incentive for customers to burn less fossil fuel, thus benefitting the environment. It might increase the seasonal variation of income for the utility, but I suspect their overall income would sustain them through low-consumption summer months.
	Oneida Arnold	Web	Rate payers vs share holders. I am deeply concerned about the use of the liquefied natural gas facility in the tideflats. This highly polluting and risky facility is located less than a mile from homes, churches, daycare facilities and schools, one of which I retired from, McCarver Elementary on Hilltop. We are living in unprecedented times of rapidly changing climate brought on by the continued and increased use of fossil fuels of which LNG is one. There is general scientific and policy consensus that the greenhouse



			<p>gases emitted by LNG facilities compromise state and agency climate goals and impede the transition to a low-carbon economy.</p> <p>During its environmental review process Puget Sound Energy indicated that only 1% or 2% of the total production at the facility would be used to benefit ratepayers. Why now are they asking for ratepayers for 43% of the cost to build the facility?</p> <p>This is an ill-conceived, expensive and harmful project that harms vulnerable communities living near the port. I stand with the Puyallup Tribe in opposition to PSE's rate increase and, indeed, the LNG facility itself.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Oneida Arnold</p>
	Al Compaan	Web	<p>Reference Docket UG-220067. We have been notified of the proposed increase in natural gas rates for year 2023 amounting to 12.98%. This is outrageous and well in excess of the rate of inflation. How does PSE expect consumers to pay such high prices? We urge UTC to deny PSE's request. Thank you.</p>
	Tom Evert	Web	<p>Rate increases too high in initial Year proposed. Do not expect their costs are increasing at that level</p>
	Dawn	Web	<p>Energy prices are way too expensive! I shouldn't have to pay more!!!</p> <p>I have lived in Bellevue for 39 years and I cannot afford to pay current prices for gas and electricity at the current rates. I certainly cannot pay more. I object to any rate increases!!!!</p>
	Joyce Tattershall	Web	<p>Docket UE-220066 - Electric Service Rate Increase Requests. PSE has requested a rate increase of 15.8% for 2023, 2.62% for 2024 and 1.2% for 2025. PSE claims the increases will mean that PSE can continue to provide safe and reliable energy service as they continue to "decarbonize" energy generation and among other things increase PSE's return on equity. These rate requests are exorbitantly high and their plans to "decarbonize" energy generation will result in a loss of power generation capability at a time when electric vehicles and the like are greatly increasing the demand for power. Solar and wind cannot provide sufficient power no matter how deeply people want to believe otherwise. The huge amount of land required by solar and/or wind greatly effects wildlife and farmland. Nuclear power plants have a long lifespan (up to 100 years for a well-maintained plant versus solar panels and wind turbines that last only around 20 years) and nuclear power plants are capable of reliably providing power 24/7/365. Wind power requires the appropriate amount of wind – not too much and not too little - and solar has to harness the power of the sun which isn't available 24 hours a day. PSE must invest in energy sources that will actually meet current and future power requirements rather than futilely investing in utopian energy sources. Please do not approve these rate increases.</p>
	Shawn Pearce	Web	<p>A double digit percentile increase in rates is absolutely ridiculous. With homelessness already rampant, and housing prices soaring, this is nothing more than yet another tax on people who are already having trouble. For any rate increase this large, the ramp up needs to be a decade or more.</p>

	Allison E Phillips	Web	<p>PSE already has an ROI of 9.4%. Now they are proposing a rate hikes of 13-14% to award themselves an even higher ROI of 9.9%. That would be absolutely unacceptable. Utilities are an economic sector which should be boringly reliable and entirely geared toward consumer access, affordability, and rate stability. There is no reason for PSE to have an ROI higher than 5%. Especially tn this time of economic uncertainty, with the highest inflation rate in 30 years, two-and-a-half years into an ongoing pandemic, with companies incepting widespread layoffs, and with rising unemployment there ought to be, unequivocally, NO path forward for PSE to be allowed to raise rates. Please do not let this happen. Thank you.</p>
	Omeed Chandra	Web	<p>Regarding Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067</p> <p>I have serious questions and concerns about PSE's proposed increase in residential electric rates to fund the Energize Eastside project. This project has not yet been completed -- in fact, in my own town of Newcastle, construction hasn't even begun -- and yet PSE is asking me to pay dramatically higher electric rates to subsidize this project. Based on my research, it's not even clear to me that this project is necessary for the needs of PSE's Washington state customers. I would like to submit my voice in opposition to this rate increase proposal.</p>
	BONNIE GRETZ	Web	<p>Re the proposed electrical rate hikes for 2023: An overall 13.59% increase is too much! I understand that circumstances require rate adjustments, but that is far too high. Residential customers would see an overall average 15.80%....way too much for one year!!!!</p>
	Brady A Brown	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067 does not support our community, while all neighbors are being directly impacted by inflation and higher than normal temperatures and poor air quality. Increasing home electrical use is unsafe and unfair, with little return. If the company wants profits for their shareholders over satisfaction for their customers, then target rate increases on their largest commercial users who regularly waste resources in unneeded lighting and air conditioning, and can better support this unnecessary burden.</p>
	Ram H	Web	<p>At a time when many people struggle to make ends meet, a move to increase the rate of return is surprisingly tone deaf. While I understand that inflation is impacting the real rate of return, increasing rates now risks putting more people, on margin, into default on their existing energy bills.</p> <p>The rate adjustment also raises the question of why PSE had four years of capital and operating investments that were not covered by existing rates? This seems like they did not operate within their budget and are now asking rate payers to make up the difference. If current management is not able to forecast, for a UTILITY, a few years in advance, it raises questions for me about whether there shouldn't be management changes.</p> <p>Finally, at a time when many renewable energy sources are *cheaper* than coal, oil, and gas, why are rate payers being asked to pay *higher* rates to fund this transition? I recently visited Bonneville and they say there isn't enough demand for them to generate power at full capacity. Why aren't we doing more with what we already have?</p>

	AMY WESTMAN	Web	<p>I absolutely REJECT the PSE proposal to raise rates!!!! ABSOLUTELY NO!!!! I want a copy of EVERY FINANCIAL DOCUMENT!!! Balance sheet, financial statement, owners equity statement, profit loss statement, capital gain/loss statement, assets and liability statement, all cash flow statements etc!!! PSE ALREADY HAS A MONOPOLY IN WASHINGTON!!! THIS IS ILLEGAL!!!!</p> <p>Raising rates on people who are already struggling, to make MORE MONEY OFF THE PEOPLE, IS UNACCEPTABLE!!!! We pay for the service, NOT their investments to make more money!!!! THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO USE PREVIOUS INVESTMENTS AND PROFIT TO UPGRADE!!!! The company ALWAYS knew they would need to upgrade their system, it is NOT the publics responsibility to PAY FOR THEIR UPGRADES AND INCREASE THEIR PROFITS!!!</p> <p>PSE SHOULD BE FINED, AND TAKEN TO COURT FOR A MONOPOLY, NOT GIVEN MORE PROFIT ON THE BACKS OF THE HARDWORKING FAMILIES OF OUR STATE!!!!</p>
	Jan Carson	Web	<p>This is not the time for customer rate hikes. How about executive pay cuts instead? How about shareholder cuts instead? People are struggling just to survive. A rate increase of almost 13% for next year is just way out of line. Make cuts at the top.</p>
	Shelly Leonard	Web	<p>I have properties serviced by both electric and/or gas. I find the companies request untimely, unreasonable and a slap in the face to those getting their service. I own a cabin that yearly loses power. The company charges me every time the power line goes down. At one point, they did not inform me of the line being down and the mast being unusable and actually closed my account---I was getting billed regularly at my permanent residence, but nothing told there was any problem on the property. We even, had called the company because the bill seemed low, we were told there was no problem, the meter was working. The end result: The account was closed, and we paid opening fee/reconnection fee. When we inquired about underground power, we had to pay for the installation...the costs were for poles, wire, digging the trench, reconnection, and transmitter. We decided not to do underground, because paying \$600+ a year is cheaper than paying \$14000.00 at once, Underground doesn't mean everything, so poles are still required, wires can still be taken down by tree limbs. The investment to get electric or gas is paid for by the person getting the product, and then, once installed the customer continues paying, the company benefits by the fees.</p> <p>It seems the customer pays for everything investments, new equipment, use of product, having property serviced, hook ups, hook ups after lines go down in storms, product installation including from poles, underground and to house, transformers, and anything else the company can think up without getting in trouble. Including new meters that are digital-read by computer instead of person. If computers are reading the meter, the companies cost has gone down by no wages, no people, no insurance. Some things we are charged for, bring the company money but the person paying their bill doesn't get any of those profits. We</p>

			<p>get to pay more.</p> <p>My opinion, sure the company can have an increase, but not more than the cost of living that the people on Social Security get. And even that is high. The gas/electric PSE needs to recognize that the people who have helped them thus far, to be a company are on Social Security, with COLA's going to the insurance industry. 12-13.5 percent is ridiculous, it is way too high.</p>
	Mary Tremain	Web	<p>My name is Mary Tremain and I am a resident of Redmond, WA.</p> <p>I am OPPOSED to PSE's proposed increase in utility rates, beginning in 2023. When consumers are struggling with higher prices for essential goods and services, it is unfair to impose larger than needed increases for their utilities. Adding an average of about \$16 per month for electricity and \$12 per month for gas to the average bill will pose a hardship for many people. I URGE the UTC to consider the welfare of Washington residents and NOT approve this rate increase.</p>
	Danielle Lankester	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy should NOT be allowed to increase rates for a project that is not yet done and whose total cost is still unknown. Over the lifetime of this project the costs to ratepayers are very significant and this proposal is happening during a time of unprecedented inflation, during which all ratepayers are already struggling with monthly bills and cost of living expenses.</p>
	Anne Dickerson	Web	<p>Pse        PSE is unreliable. We have had many outages in the 10 years we have lived here. After losing the contents of of a refrigerator and freezer twice and being dependent on neighbors for heat, we finally bought a generator.        PSE is not investing in energy storage, time of day pricing or efficiency as other utilities are doing. I don't think the company will meet state mandates.        Please do not allow their rate increases as requested PSE.</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p> <p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right."</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p>

			<p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG’s clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE’s proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p>
	ROBERT D CARLSON	Web	<p>References: Dockets UE-220066 and Dockets UG-220067</p> <p>Please reject these Puget Sound Energy Rate Increases.</p> <p>Proposed rate increases are excessive, and contribute directly to and exacerbate out of control inflation that we are all suffering from. Electric and Natural Gas utilities outside the state of Washington state, such as Colorado are not seeking to rate increases. According to PSE literature, these increases provide 'safe and reliable energy service'. Statements such as that indicate PSE is 'tone deaf' to the economy within the state of Washington and is seeking unwarranted and unreasonable profitability.</p> <p>Thank you for thoughtfully considering my exhortation.</p>
	Melinda D	Web	<p>I OPPOSE the significant rate increases proposed by Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>First, a rate increase would cause substantial hardship for consumers, particularly with current inflation and lack of corresponding wage growth.</p> <p>Second, PSE’s claimed reasons for the rate increases fail to reveal the truth—that they are trying to cover costs for their LNG facility at the Port of Tacoma, which was pushed through on unreliable data and is harmful to the environment and the surrounding communities, including the tribe. It’s disgusting.</p>
	Claire Wilkinson	Web	<p>I oppose PSE's proposed rate hikes on electricity and gas. Especially at a time when people are struggling to find affordable housing and pay their bills, this is just pure greed. If PSE won't act like a good corporate citizen and balance profits with compassion then I ask the UTC to step in to protect consumers. Thank you.</p>
	Leah Dowd	Web	<p>Please reconsider the electricity rate increase. In a time when recession is negatively impacting most Americans, basic utilities is not something families should risk going without. Many people are cutting back on unnecessary things to afford groceries and increasing gas prices. Raising electricity rates will further</p>

			increase the hardships that many Americans are currently facing. Keep our necessary utilities affordable for all.
John & Maggie Stasny	Web	<p>This 2023 15.8% rate increase is detrimental to seniors on fixed SSI that is/has declined. Yes SSI got a raise of 5.9% but what is covered up is Medicare was \$144 &amp; now \$170+. This deduction has taken away more of the SSI discretionary funds that pay for other living bills in an inflationary economy is WAY TO MUCH.. We seniors are trying to live our last years out in our homes &amp; PSE is making that impossible with a increase request that would cost over \$100/year more. We have OIL HEAT &amp; empty tanks &amp; have to use electric, &amp; NO AC to cool this summer. The fireplace is not efficient to heat with &amp; burn bands make this a non-viable solution to cut down on electricity use. Years ago we were quoted over \$5,000 to get natural gas to our home if it were to be installed down our road, where we are 750 feet from where it has stopped, &amp; that was when heating oil was \$1.50/gallon, STILL NG LINE NOT EXTENDED.. With an increase of 13% on NG, being requested &amp; installation &amp; conversion of heating &amp; appliances, that rate increase puts that out of financial reach if the NG line were extended to our road frontage.. In our situation, solar is not a possibility unless the near 100 foot evergreen trees on my south neighbor's property were removed or severely topped &amp; who pays for that.</p> <p>I have felt that it was the medical that would financially kick us out on the street, "Can't die until your broke". Now it is the energy suppliers that are implying "can't die until your broke" !!</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW AN INCREASE OF THIS MAGNETUDE !!</p> <p>John Stasny</p>	
Lisa Marahrens Gilbert	Web	<p>Raising the electric service by 13.59 percent in ONE year-2023 &amp; raising the natural gas service by 12.89 percent in ONE year-2023 is an undue burden on customers-TOO MUCH.</p> <p>The following years are quite modest in comparison, please reconsider this proposal.</p>	
Pamela L Spangler	Web	<p>PSE should not look to its customers to "recover increased operating costs" as stated in the insert in my recent bill. They should also not look to their customers to increase their authorized return on equity to 9.9% from 9.4%. Many households are struggling due to COVID- it is not as though the marketplace has recovered and peoples' jobs have been restored. An increase of 13.59 next year, leaving out the other additional increases, is not reasonable, and should not be approved. PSE is the only game in town for many, despite regulation, and it is not as though customers can shop elsewhere for their electricity needs. This rate increase if approved would further impact many households already struggling, and would go into effect at the peak season of consumption- especially for those in apartments where baseboard electrical heat is the only option. This request should be denied.</p>	
Carolina Montenegro	Web	<p>Please do not raise rates. How can we afford to live if we are already going check to check. This is impossible, outrageous.</p>	

	kathleen a wyer	Web	<p>Hello,          Please note the 15.80% average rate increase in 2023 is unconscionable to the average home owner. While we are prepared for small increases, which may be reflected in kind with my retirement check, I will find it difficult to pay these higher amounts.          I find it off putting to read the justifications for recovery are heavily weighted to operating investments and returns on equity for PSE holdings.          Please find your recovery costs through larger corporations who can afford the increases and get tax cuts.          Regards,          Kathleen Wyer</p>
	Cody McDonald	Web	<p>As a residential consumer I am absolutely opposed to a rate increase by PSE. They are profiting plenty at current rates, and a rate increase would just be pure greed and hurt working families while we are all already strapped and can barely afford to live in this state anymore.</p>
	Steven Halterman	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy's has requested a rate increase. Our household and small business is being to use electrification for our homes and businesses, which is a big hit on the budgets for us as individuals and our small business. Increased rates while forcing us to consume more energy through PSE rather than natural gas or other forms of energy...is harmful period and could be economically devastating during today's massive inflationary pressures.</p>
	Karen Hollenback	Web	<p>They propose residential customers would see a 15.8% increase in electric service for 2023 and a 12.15% increase in gas service for 2023. They indicate this would give them an increase from 9.4% to 9.9% in authorized return on equity, among other reasons for their proposed rate increase. I am not willing to pay such a large increase in rates for them to increase their profits for stockholders. I am already trying to cut back on usage as part of our budgeting process and my income definitely isn't going up by 15% this year to cover utility expenses. In my opinion this is a ridiculously large rate hike for 2023. Please look at a lower rate hike for 2023!!</p>
	Gay Kiesling	Web	<p>The proposed 2023 residential customer rate increase is absolutely ridiculous. "PSE Notice of requested changes" shows a 15.8% increase for 2023 with even more increases for 2024 and 2025. Since the residential rate is higher for all 3 years than the overall rate increase, then corporations must be getting a rate decrease. Why is there no explanation of this? Tacoma Public Utilities is proposing a rate increase of 4.2% . This % would be manageable. Energy bill assistance does not help those on the very edge of eligibility. Assistance should be extended to those of us who live in 1967 building with no insulation in ceiling, walls, and single pane windows. I live in such an old building since I cannot afford better as a senior. Owner increased my rent by 47% since 2020, but refuses to upgrade windows or insulation. I have explained PSE energy savings programs to owner, but he wants something free, of course. I asked PSE customer service to send info on programs to owner and they refused, saying info can be accessed online. UTC and PSE need to have the force of law to get properties upgraded. The burden of energy wasted falls on those of us who can least afford to pay.</p>

	Keith Jewell	Web	<p>The following is a quote from the PSE rate raise proposal:</p> <p>"To increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%"</p> <p>Over the last 50 years, the stock market as a whole has achieved a 10% return. Yet despite being below return on their investment, somehow PSE has been able to attract ready, even eager investors for their business. They do not need additional profit in order to attract additional investment. In comparison, Safeway investment filings indicate approximately a 2% net profit, and they are still able to attract needed investment without trouble. 9.4% is absurd, to say nothing of 9.9%.</p> <p>I urge you to reject the portion of this rate increase designed to increase profitability. I further urge you to reject an additional portion to reduce their allowed return to a more reasonable level.</p> <p>You will not harm PSE by pushing their profit margins lower. Instead, you will reduce what is effectively a hidden tax on utility services, levied by private investors. Utilities are a fact of modern life, critical to modern living. Make certain they are delivered in a way that is fair to the public, who needs them to work and live.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Russell White	Web	<p>PSE's proposed rate increase is scandalous. They want to raise our rates 15% in 2023, 2.41% in 2024 and 21.18% in 2025; are you kidding me. This proposal is nothing less than simple profiteering. This proposal should be denied. It is not in the public interest and is an abuse of their monopoly.</p>
	Daniel Kukhar	Web	<p>Puget sound energy plans on increasing rates for electric and natural gas services. By 15% for residents. The questions would be why? I major source of our energy are dams. So the question would be what are their numbers? How much is the cost to maintain it all against how much they make in profit. When we have the best renewable energy In the nation other than nuclear and yet prices are still going up. They should give more information to show why they would need to increase it so much.</p>
	Nicola Robinson	Web	<p>Attention: Utilities and Transportation Commission, Attention: Attorney Generals Office. WA I need to find the correct email address. The one given in the document from PSE, comments@utc.wa.gov was not valid.</p> <p>Ref: PSE's Filing of a, 'General Rate Case,' requesting a multiyear adjustment to electric and natural gas rates.</p> <p>Based on my comments below, please deny any and all of the increases in both electric and natural gas servives requested by PSE.</p>



COMMENT:

1) PSE has done nothing to update the electric infrastructure in older neighborhoods in Renton, and yet it wants more and more money for the same out of date equipment, and problems associated with it - such as overloaded transformers?

2) PSE has been studying about where it could put BESS (Battery Energy Storage Systems) in various counties in WA, during 2021.

These systems are hazardous not only to the environment, but also are poorly regulated, with alleged built in safety designs and monitoring, both of which have failed multiple times over the past 4 years. There are reports of overheating, fires and toxic gasses resulting from BESS all over the US and the world.

There are various institutions that are studying alternatives to the Li-ion batteries that BESS currently use, and they have results from current research into using a substance called 'Chittin' (Chitin) a discarded waste product from oysters and lobsters. This will hold a charge, is biodegradable, and would fulfill the need for batteries suitable for grid sized installations, and is safe.

The technology is in its infancy, and there should be no rush to install BESS with the current risky LI-ion batteries, when the technology will change for safer alternatives.

PSE attempted, with the backing of 'TENASKA' a multibillion dollar energy company which is out of state, to push through a 9.3 acre BESS within 50' of a community of 138 homes, on a parcel that is rural, with many critical and sensitive areas, and zoned LDSF, (Low density single family). This took place in Renton this year, in 2022, and there is documentation to support my statements with the city.

Their argument is to satisfy requirements to decrease green house gasses by the dates established in CETA. They gave no regard for, how the safety issues that such an installation would impact our community, never mind the potential for pollution of the Cedar River, and it's water shed, critical for salmon restoration - which was less than 150' from the proposed parcel.

Any plans that PSE has to build BESS, will not be paid for by PSE, but they will involve energy companies such as 'TENASKA' to fund these, and they will share in some of the financial benefits - at our expense, both in the decreased quality of our lives and more financial hardship.

3) What federal funding has been available to PSE for the various studies it has been involved in regarding BESS in 2021?

PSE is a publicly traded company, and as such has it first responsibility to it's shareholders, and as you have seen by the information in item #2, its responsibility and concern is certainly not for the customers it serves - we are secondary.

Granted, PSE have increased the capacity of high voltage wires in it's 'Energize Eastside' project, and have required Bellevue to build the 'Richards Creek Sub-station,' because Bellevue has had a short fall in its energy needs since 2014, documented in PSE's, 'Energize Eastside' Study from that same year.

Building the BESS here in Renton, was for the purpose of transferring additional energy to Bellevue (also

			<p>documented) from the Talbot Hill Sub-station in Renton, not for Renton's benefit.          Renton has no energy shortfall.          Bellevue has no developable land in its downtown (documented in their 'Comprehensive Land Use study,' and so they thought they would make us the 'Fall guy' to satisfy their needs, despite the risk it would put our community in, as well as our decreased property values. All this with the assistance of PSE, deeply involved in the project.          Documentation of all my statements is available.          4) Considering the current economic environment, where families are just now coming out of a pandemic, and are struggling with the increased cost of basics, how does PSE justify these proposed increases?          Using the argument, of satisfying CETA does not wash.</p> <p>PSE needs to feed back into the current infrastructure some of the billions of dollars in assets it currently holds, instead of giving it to its shareholders, and instead of putting the cost on the backs of those who can ill afford increases.          PSE should be required to use those assets to improve the infrastructure, especially in older neighborhoods, and also to make sure it is aware of new, safer technology already in research, instead of trying to force through the dangerous Li-ion battery installations, for it's own benefit, increased revenue.</p> <p>Nicola Robinson.</p>
	Jaclyn Main	Web	<p>We the public can not take another rate hike, please for the love of god don't allow it.</p>
	Andrew Wiesenfeld	Web	<p>Per the proposed UE220066 and UG220067 the following adjustments/comments are submitted for the record and UTC consideration.</p> <p>The proposed rate adjustments are excessively front loaded.Recommend the following rate structure/rate increases:          Yr 1- 2.0%, Yr 2- 4.0% ,Yr 3- 6 for a total increase of 12% over three years (UE220066)          Yr 1- 2.5%, Yr 2- 4.5%, Yr 3- 5.5% for a total of 12.5% over three years (UG220067)</p> <p>The above reduction and restructure recognizes the impact of inflation over the next 36 months on the average residential consumer of natural gas and electrical services.Just like end users,PSE must tighten its belt to absorb some of the inflationary effects on input costs.</p>

			<p>PSE has the option of accessing both federal and state COVID recovery funds to help offset past as well as anticipated future cost increase. In addition future Congressional legislation will provide additional potential funds .</p> <p>PSE is not a publicly traded company, there are no shareholder demands for return on equity. An 8 to 8.5 ROE along with access to state and federal grant monies are sufficient to meet the goals and service metrics PSE has established for themselves. The recent survey results contained in the PSE newsletter does not suggest otherwise. Respectfully submitted</p>
	Garry Kampen	Web	<p>In reference to Dockets UE 220066 and UG 220067, I'm strongly opposed to the enormous rate hikes for gas and electricity. At a time when residential customers are already suffering from 10% inflation and seeing investments plunge, PSE asks for rate increases of 15.80 and 12.15%, likely much more than their own increase in costs. I'm getting .01% on my bank account, other assets are shrinking; yet PSE wants to raise its return from 9;4 to 9.9%! Unconscionable! I urge the UTC to reject these unwarranted increases!</p>
	amanda león	Web	<p>I am against the PSE filing for a rate increase. This is not within the standardized cost of living increases. The rate increases have been raised exponentially in the past few years and this is not needed. PSE should not continue to increase rates.</p>
	Larry	Web	<p>Strongly disagree with rate increases. I encourage the board to deny any such increases. I don't think you will find a single citizen that would agree with paying more. Puget Sound Energy needs to do more with less. It's time for them to conserve just like they preach to the consumer.</p>
	Jeannie Berg	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066 (electric service) The proposal to increase electric rates 15.80% in 2023 is an inordinately high burden on a residential customer. There are two more rate increases in subsequent years. The high cost of inflation has hit hard, and this rate increase is in addition to increased property taxes in Thurston county. I am against such a high increase in rates. Please reconsider such a drastic increase especially hard on senior citizens like us. In my opinion such an increase is unfair because it is such a high rate in the first year and then it continues for two more years. PSE wants an approximately 20% rate hike over the next 3 years. Why not levy this amount at no more than 5% over the next three years, i.e. 2023, 2024 and 2025? Thank you.</p>
	Charlyn Gagnon	Web	<p>(Comments typed verbatim per customer request to Sam Cooper on the consumer protection line 8/2/2022, 9:57 a.m.) Our income is not going to go up 15.8%, we are seniors. I mean, my husband is still working just to keep up.</p>
	Beverly McKinnon	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>I don't feel that rate increase is justified. We watched our home built in 1990 as first-time homeowners. We live in a cul-de-sac and we're on the wrong power grid. So we lose power when a good wind comes by, even though our utilities are below ground and now I don't feel like we have to pay more when we're not getting what we should in the beginning. And it's kind of disconcerting when our neighbors two doors down lose power and everybody else around me has purchased generators and automatic-start generators. We shouldn't</p>

			<p>have to go through that and I just want to know what are they doing in terms of grid maintenance? Evidently, not much at all has been done and like I said, we are the first-time owners of this house and it's always been a problem since 09/1990 that we've been here. So, this is kind of upsetting to know that the rates are gonna go up and we're not getting adequate service in our part of the neighborhood. Even today, we're looking at considering complete solar so we can perhaps get off or use PSE as minimally as possible and that comes at a steep price. Should we have to be making these kinds of decisions is my question. It seems to me that PSE needs to do maintenance on the power grids. And if they could say, we've put "so many dollars" and I don't know what those figures or amounts are to maintain a power system, something needs to be evident to justify why the increase is necessary. As I said, we spoke earlier this morning with a solar installer and it just doesn't seem right we should have to resort—You know, everything's trying to go green, but I just don't see where, you know, raising rates is warranted. I mean, maybe they are doing some things, but I don't have that visibility is what I'm saying. At the same time, I dread when the winter comes. I mean, even in March or April of this year we were in the dark.</p>
	Philip Wilging	Web	<p>I believe that the proposed rate hikes for 2023 across both electricity and natural gas are grossly overstated. Further I find that the reasons offered for the proposed increases are insufficient to justify the size of the increase.</p>
	Constance T Lantagne	Web	<p>Hello UTC        PSE provided Residential customers notice of a 3-yr rate hike for Electric &amp; Natural Gas services starting January 1, 2023        Electric: 13.59% (2023) 2.62% (2024) 1.20% (2025)        Natural Gas: 12.15% (2023) 2.19% (2024) 1.74% (2025)        This comes on the heels of the Inflation Reduction Act just signed into law. This law makes the claim that it will save households \$170 to \$220 annually and will reduce electricity volatility. Rate payers will be insulated from volatility in natural gas prices with electricity rates projected to decrease eve under a high natural gas scenario.</p> <p>The proposed 2023 rate hike is unacceptable when you look at the following 2 years under 3%. All 3 years should be under 3%.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your support of Washington State Residential energy consumers        Constance Lantagne</p>
	Marc simons	Web	<p>The proposed rate increase for 2023 is excessive</p>
	Dale L. Weir	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066 and UE-220067:        No rate increase! This is about profits for the shareholders, not better service for the customers. We are already dealing with 9% inflation and don't need more.</p>

			PSE should be spending some of their profits on maintenance of the existing infrastructure. They need to take care of the customers!
	Camelia Chatfield	Web	Taken by CTC This raise, which is outrageous, will cause me as well as other seniors on fixed incomes a real problem with the raise which is significant. The increase in the bill impact. PSE has traditionally, for 25 years that I have had it here, asked for a rate increase every year at least twice. This one is the most biggest increase that I've seen in a while and so I recommend the WAUTC deny their request.
	Julie Wallace	Web	PSE list 6 reasons for the rate increase. I support 5 of those reasons. However, I do not support the 6th; to increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. I would like to see this reason eliminated from the rate increase proposal and the rate increase amount adjusted accordingly.
	Karen Sue Witmer	Web	I'm a senior citizen living on my own and on a fixed income. I have never felt so helpless because rising prices on every thing make me feel like I'm treading water and am starting to drown. The rate increase Puget Sound Energy will have a major impact on my budget.
	Frederick Robinson	Web	In reference to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067, I note that one of PSE's justifications for increasing residential rates is to increase "authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%". Am I correct in understanding that means guaranteed profit? 9.4% return is enviable in the current market. What is a typical return for other comparably managed utility companies?
	Norene Scott	Web	We do not need this extra capacity and we don't want it. The cost is unknown and the unwarranted.
	Steve Fane	Web	I have recently been informed that PSE proposes a 15-18% rate increase for 2023. While understanding that cost of doing business has increased this rate request is completely out of line with industry standards. This creates an additional burden on home owners in the Sudden Vally community that are seeing increase across all home ownership costs. This adds an unreasonable additional cst in an are that we have no viable alternatives. I am opposed to this rate request. Regards, Steve Steve Fane
	Leo Hopcroft	Web	PSE is asking for about 20% rate increase over three years. The rates are already too high. These increases are unbearably high especially at a time when rents, mortgages, food, and fuel prices are making it nearly impossible for people to get by. I think that these extreme increases will devastate many families, including my own, and add to the homelessness epidemic.
	Mark Cadle	Web	17% increase by 2023 is ridiculous. I understand a percent here or there, but not this current proposal.
	Richard Witte	Web	*Comments typed by Sam Cooper at customer request via the Consumer Protection hotline. This residential increase is nearly 16%. Especially in today's world I am definitely opposed to that. It is beyond reason.

Joy Sanderson	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>We're against the proposal of the increase because its too much, too fast. We understand there would always have to be an increase, but not so great because salaries and retirements don't keep up with an increase of that much.</p>
Sarah Holberg	Web	<p>Regarding docket ue-220066, the proposal to increase utility rates by 14%. Raising rates when the company is experiencing increased profits and has plenty of cash flow is egregious. I do not support the increase.</p>
Janis Vander Ploeg	Web	<p>We are already coping with ridiculously high inflation, real estate tax, and gas prices. Residents cannot afford a 12% increase or all of us will quickly become the ones requiring assistance, which defeats part of the reasoning behind the increase itself. A higher than normal increase, but still affordable—for instance, a 5% increase—is reasonable.</p>
Barbara Wahli	Web	<p>I read that Puget Sound Energy wants to increase power rates by 13.6% - 15.8% beginning Jan. 1, 2023. I completely understand costs increase but this seems a bit steep! Especially since in 2024 it drops to ~2.5% increase then 2025 to ~1.2% increase. Please don't allow them to increase our rates this much!</p>
Steven Walcker	Web	<p>Docket UG-220067, Natural Gas Service. PSE has proposed increases to natural gas services that reach too far. As proposed, over a 3 year period, they equal 17.09% when added together. In 2023, PSE proposes a 12.98% increase which is rather shocking. As a residential consumer of natural gas, I understand the need for a "reasonable" rate increases and wonder if I'm shouldering the financial burden of other class of service customers. The proposed rate increases for 2024 and 2025 are modest, reasonable and something I can live with. I trust the commission to act in good faith on my behalf and suggest that they use their best effort to find a better settlement agreement with PSE. At present, I'm not able to tolerate such a draconian increase given the current economic situation in our country.</p> <p>Thank You        Steve Walcker</p>
Bryn Kildow	Web	<p>PSE has continuously posted gross profits. 3 years ago, we replaced out out-dated heat pump with a more energy efficient one, but our bills remained the same. Finally, we were contacted and told that they don't actually check the meters but "estimate" usage. We had been overcharged to the point that we went 4 payment periods (8 months) without a bill. I would assume we weren't the only ones that happened to and PSE happily took the free interest on our money. Don't let corporate greed for ever-higher profits rule the day.</p>
Paul Lindberg	Web	<p>PSE wants to increase their rates by 15%.</p> <p>I told them two years ago that would happen if they jumped on the silly windmills &amp; solar cells bandwagon.</p> <p>Those new technologies are not ready for prime time. They are way too expensive, dangerous, and terribly destructive of the environment as well. Maybe in 10 or 20 years they can compete on the open market.</p>

			<p>Please reject PSE's rate increase, and tell them to go back to doing what they do best - with proven and inexpensive hydro, nuclear, and coal.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Leaf Schumann	Web	<p>Absolutely not! Yet one more corporate entity, along with my insurance company, that wants to dig deeper into my limited pocketbook at a time when my income is shrinking. Live within a budget, PSE! NO to rate increases of this amount at this time. And I vote every single cycle.</p>
	truyen vu	Web	<p>the proposed rate increase of ~17% is unacceptable. My annual income does not rise even close to 17%, therefore i'm unable to afford to pay for this proposed increase.</p>
	Damon Cali	Web	<p>Regarding Docketts UE-220066 (electric service) and UG-220067 (natural gas service)</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases for both electric and natural gas service. They seem excessive, particularly the first year (2023).</p> <p>Damon Cali          PSE customer</p>
	Sharon Schultz	Web	<p>(Comments received via consumer complaint line and typed verbatim by Sam Cooper). There are senior citizens who are barely making it financially, who seriously cannot afford another utilities rate hike. We will have our elderly citizens literally dying in their homes in the winter if this goes through. Thank you very much for your time.</p>
	Curry Curmuggin	Web	<p>The request to increase Puget Sound Energy natural gas service by 12.15% in 2023 must be denied. This increase is beyond the pale and is a sick symptom of corporate greed. SAY NO TO THIS OUTRAGEOUS INCREASE.</p>
	Steven Quesnel	Web	<p>My bill for 3/2 was \$575, the bill for 5/2 was \$756, and the bill for 7/2 was \$999.66. Same house, same number of occupants, same appliances, same furnace/heat pump, basically everything the same. If PSE is already raising my bill by 25% every two months, I don't think they need to raise it any more.</p> <p>Also, I have budget payment plan bills that come every two months. It was originally every month and it should be every month but they claim to not be able to fix the issue that caused it change. If PSE is that bad at running an accounting system, why should I believe the numbers that they generate from it to justify a rate increase?</p>
	zerman whitley	Web	<p>Rate of return should be reduced to level of inflation.</p>

	N. Doe	Web	This increase comes at a time where nearly everything is beyond affordable for the average person. It feels like taking advantage of this time of inflation versus a true need for an increase.
	Sean Barnett	Web	(Comments typed verbatim by Sam Cooper at request of consumer on CP line). When they sold the PSE, we had an increase. That was so they could sell it. Then they promised with those increases the new company wouldn't make any more new increases. They have been increasing us ever since. Also, the rate of the increase they're asking for is absolutely ridiculous considering all the increases we have have up til now.
	Ronald Killian	Web	Reference to Document UE-20066 and UG-220067 - My wife and I are approaching 80 this year and are on a rather fixed income. We both have worked hard and raised children to adulthood. We have lived in our current home since 1989 and paid the ever increasing taxes without complaint, realizing we are not alone in this ever increasing cost of living. However, this last notification from PSE about the increase percentage of rates to be applied is beyond ridiculous. It is bordering criminal in our view. Our income ability is limited but PSE feels it is necessary to increase both gas and electric rates over the next 3 years. Our ability to maintain our bills with this rate increase is bordering on the impossible. Consider this letter as a protest and outrage for the proposed increased taxes..
	Marilee	Web	<p>Your press release states that the “rate request reflects investments to improve service and reliability, meet state clean energy policy objectives and assist low-income customers.</p> <p>On the topic of service improvement, you speak of advanced metering infrastructure. My concern is with smart meters and the additional EMFs they produce around my living area. The 2 way communication of these meters almost implies an invasion of privacy.</p> <p>Regarding clean energy I am disappointed to see that PSE is either willingly or being forced to bend to the false ideology of climate change, which I do not believe is an existential threat (nor do many of the honest scientists!) Who are these “stakeholders” who want to go “further and faster to achieve these goals?” The word “stakeholder” sends up red flags of ESG scores that many companies are currently using for accountability and is part of the globalist agenda. Solar panels will not meet energy needs in the PNW and panels need to be replaced every 10-15 years. Replacement will be costly and discarding used panels is not environmentally friendly. Will panels be made in the US or will China, as the world’s largest producer, corner the market? EVs are not practical in the near future. The batteries require resources that the US does not have (lithium, cobalt, etc) and many of these resources are not unlimited and would eventually cause world wide strip mining of them. Whose economy benefits from batteries? Again, disposal of used batteries is an environmental hazard.</p> <p>Regarding assisting low income customers, I believe in compassion for those struggling with their PSE bills, but it appears that my raise in rates will help fund those who can’t make their payments. How long until my bill is so high that I also BECOME one of those who can’t pay their bill? And if there are 90,000 local families in this dilemma, how will those people ever be able to buy an EV? You refer to a “return on equity”</p>



			<p>which to me means lowering everyone to the lowest common denominator. Will my rate increase reflect an effort to support those who are struggling in the name of “equity” until we are all struggling?</p> <p>I am opposed to these rate increases and strongly question the true motivation behind them!</p>
	Lisa M Graham	Web	<p>I am strongly opposed to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. The negative effect this proposal will have on families and seniors already struggling to keep their heads above water. We all are experiencing a great hardship from price hikes, on groceries, rent, household items and gasoline while wages have not increased to keep up with these increases. This increase will ultimately cause families to default on paying their PSE bill. With this in mind, PSE should not make it harder for families to survive. It's PSE duty to serve the public by providing fair pricing for utilities, not raping them.</p>
	John Giuliano	Web	<p>Regarding the proposed 2023 rate increase of 13.59 %, I would like the commissioners to reject this exorbitant amount. No customer should be subsidizing the 'green' switchover of power generation from proven, lower cost and acceptable pollution levels methods. The hidden costs of battery storage, wind generation maintenance, and other futuristic methods should be borne by for-profit companies, not utilities. To be noted is that the most vocal proponents, in our state, of 'green' energy have very large incomes and are not on Social Security fixed income.</p>
	Jon-Mitchel Sachs	Web	<p>2/3s of our power in Washington is hydro electricity. As a single father with 2 kids I should not be carrying the burden of PSE corporate greed when energy is quite plentiful in my region. I oppose the 13% or 15% increase in rates. Middle and lower class working family's are already at the breaking point between rampant inflation and gasoline price hikes. Now is the time to re-examine PSE costs and profits and cut its own fat and not price gouge residential customers to save its profits. If the energy sector cannot or will not manage its pricing responsibly there will eventually civil unrest over absurd energy pricing.</p>
	Dylan Rickert	Web	<p>1st: Another rate increase for the general public that cannot afford it, what happened to the profits from last year. Corporate America has had more money inserted into its allocated areas of use than any previous year on record.</p> <p>2nd:          The energy crisis is evidently getting bigger, and less affordable in the PSE's eyes. Although management and industry cost for infrastructure have peaked, we are now trailing the world energy economy that we previously have been a native leader in.</p>
	Brian K Shaw	Web	<p>Reference Dockets UE-220066 (electric service) and UG-220067 (natural gas service). Rates should never exceed cost-of-living increases to ensure those on fixed-incomes are not forced to pay costs beyond their means. Forcing users to pay recovery costs for poor investments and to then suggest increasing rates for additional investments is ludicrous, as it fails to hold those responsible for the management of the investments accountable. Provide full transparency. All such rate increase proposals should include the details of how any additional funds (i.e., \$310.6 million and any future years' increases) will be distributed</p>

			<p>across each adjustment and how they will be accounted for accordingly. It seems that there are always requests for more money, with only vague budget and resource management and execution details provided. No discretionary funds should be collected or allowed to be expended. Full accountability and approval by the appropriate parties should be required prior to collection and not after the monies are obligated or spent.</p>
	Kristin Keyes-Halterman	Web	<p>PSE has had numerous rate increases and with the push to require all electrification of homes and businesses, this alone will increase the cost to individual and small business budgets. Increasing the rates while increasing the need to consume more energy through PSE rather than natural gas or other forms of energy...is harmful to individuals, business, and the overall economy during massive inflationary pressures.</p>
	Michael McAuley	Web	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am not in favor of increasing the rate of return that PSE is asking for. They already have a very good deal.</p> <p>Rate increases that don't translate to better service or stem from legitimate inflation are just a state sanctioned, guaranteed wealth transfer to wealthy investors.</p> <p>Working class people don't mind paying our way but it needs to be fair.</p> <p>Please do not accept PSE's rate increase request.</p> <p>Most sincerely,</p> <p>Mike McAuley        Bellingham</p>
	Joseph Rinehart	Web	<p>re:UE-220066 and UG-220067;</p> <p>this rate proposal is unconscionable amounting to 19.62% for electric service and 16.08% for gas, a combined increase of 35.7% over the next 3 years. The reasons given amount to a request to increase PSE's profits. Instead of allowing private corporations to strain citizens to pay for necessary utilities, the State should be subsidizing such things as the development of green power including universal solar energy for households, heat pumps to update household HVAC systems reducing use of gas and electricity, household insulation and window tinting to reduce heat infiltration and loss along with conversion of industrial use to green supported power sources. Reducing the use of carbon based power and the need for power from PGE does not give them the right to increase rates to make up for resultant loss of profits let alone an increase in profits. The provision of utilities necessary to sustain life should not be profit driven at all, especially when profits outweigh public safety.</p>
	Diane Utter	Web	<p>Please consider requiring Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to make their utility rate increases more gradual. We are still in a global pandemic and we have rampant inflation right now. That is not the time for double digit increases, as proposed (13.59% and 12.98%). I'm sure PSE can justify the increases with data about their</p>

			needs, but real people and families will be affected. Our family will be able to handle the increase so this is not a self-serving comment. I'm just very concerned about households that are already on the edge of being able to afford their utilities. Thank you for considering my views.
	Zhanbing Wu	Web	PSE's proposed rate increase is outrageous!!!
	Jason Shepherd	Web	PSE already has some of the highest utility rates in the state, especially when compared to publicly run PUDs. I believe they have an interest in attempting to increase rates to please their shareholders but at the cost of their customers. They want but do not need this increase. They can and will continue to squeeze as much as they can out of their customers.
	Cynthia Jaeger	Web	This is a HUGE increase request that is mainly to make their shareholders happy. This will be a HUGE burden on most of us struggling to keep up with taxes and inflation. The percentage of people requesting help to keep the heat on is going to jump. Please deny the request to jack up our costs. Too many of us that are barely making ends meet will have to start making decisions on heating the home or feeding our family.
	sharon schultz	Web	As a senior citizen I must request that the latest rate hike be denied. Please charge business' a bit more. Those of us on Social Security simply cannot afford to pay the shareholders what they want. I know that charging business' will also cost us more, but if it is .10 or .40 more to buy something that is much easier to bear than a \$300.00 a month utility bill. I wanted to attend the video conference on the 28th, but only received notice of same on the 27th and was unable to rearrange my schedule. Please, please reconsider this rate increase!!  Sincerely, Sharon Schultz, PSE customer and Senior Citizen
	Kalla Susort	Web	I recently attending a Port of Anacortes meeting that included their proposed budget for 2023. The rate increase for their employees was 3% and for their management 6%. So that falls into alinement with my work history of wage increases. Again I request that PSE 13.59% increase in rates is NOT Acceptable. And should not even be considered. Instead keep it in alignment with the wage proposed rate increases for employees in Washington State.
	Filemon Bohmer-Tapia	Web	At a time when so many are struggling economically due to rapid and exorbitant increases in the cost of living, coupled with very limited wage increases, it would be very irresponsible of Puget Sound Energy to raise energy rates at this time. People's valid concerns about this proposed rate increase are taken seriously and the the proposal is rescinded. Heating and electricity should be treated as basic necessities, not commodities to raise profits.
	Jason Den Hartog	Web	During unprecedented inflation, now is NOT the time to increase rates from PSE for Washington's struggling families. Please vote against raising our utility rates.

	gary vieth	Web	<p>these comments are related to PSE dockets UE-220066 and UE-22067.</p> <p>The rate increases PSE is requesting are horrendous, particularly for 2023. There is no justification for the size of the increases of approximately 13% in 2023. How much of that is profit for PSE and how much is for expenses. And how much of the expenses were actually required. I recommend that PSE's request be denied.</p>
	Ahmed Azmy	Web	<p>Utility companies are capitalizing on opportunities to take advantage of end consumers hiding under inflation to increase their profitability on the expense of customers.</p> <p>In the case for "Puget Sound Energy", they are requesting a higher rate increase of (15.8) for the first year, going to almost (20%) in 3 years with vague reasons. They list, in detail, how the increased rates affect customers, but they don't provide detailed tables of the expenses they use to justify the rate increase. In WA state for example, most of the electricity is coming from "Hydro" not fossil fuels, so there is very little dependency on fossil fuel cost increases.</p> <p>Once a rate increase takes effect, it never goes down even if the costs go down afterwards. The end customer is usually on the losing end.</p>
	Julia Poland	Web	<p>PSE is proposing increasing rates for electricity for my region. I am expressing my dismay at this increase. I am on a fixed income, and already have difficulty paying my minimum due every month. An increase in rates would cause an undue hardship for me.</p> <p>Thank you for considering denying their proposal.</p>
	Aswin Gunawan	Web	<p>The proposed rate increases for energy &amp; natural gas service is unacceptable, in particular the double digit percentage increase proposed to take effect on January 1, 2023. Energy bills have taken a huge chunk of our monthly expenses already in the past year, double digit increase in both electric and natural gas service will make energy bill completely unaffordable for renters like us. The justification provided such as to increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9% sound like capitalistic profit maximizing effort without any consideration on hardship incurred on people lives by introducing such drastic rate increase. Please disapprove!</p>
	Matthew Colpitts	Web	<p>The proposed rate increase of 13.59% for electric and 12.98% for gas is too much of an increase. At a time when consumers and families are dealing with inflation and other increased cost.</p>
	Stephen Dodd	Web	<p>Typed verbatim by Sam Cooper at customer request per call to Consumer Protection line - The first reason I am opposed is it's an exorbitant increase in rates. Over the next three years it's terribly high based on the fact that the economy isn't doing well. It's over and above any plan for recovery of the economy. The second reason is PSE is a privately-held company and I think that the shareholders should take the brunt of the increase in a reduction in their dividends. That's extremely important. These people invested in PSE and they should realize they're not going to be making money every year. The reason I'm saying this is I'm 82 years old and I don't need this stuff. But I tell you what, I appreciate your advocacy.</p>

	Catherine Morris	Web	Proposed rate hikes are astronomical and unreasonable. With no other options for electrical service, we are held hostage.
	Armand Aghabegian	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is making large investments towards long distance transmission lines and is trying to recover some of that expenditure by raising residential power rates. At the same time, PSE is not spending sufficient money and efforts in making the local distribution networks more robust, updated and reliable. In the past five years my block alone has had three major outages, one lasting 27 hours due to a failed transformer that resulted in the entire contents of my freezer and refrigerator to spoil. The other outage lasted 14 hours during a winter storm. That outage had two root causes. 1) improperly fastened power line to the local pole that used a temporary clip-on fastener from a previously rushed repair; 2) tree branches that were too close to the lines and caused the line to slip out of the temporary holder. The third outage lasted 7 hours and was the result of an old transformer failure when another tree branch fell on the wires during another winter ice storm.</p> <p>As Washington State and cities of Seattle and Bellevue move more towards carbon emissions reduction by advocating the use of more electrical appliances as opposed to gas powered, the reliability of the local distribution network becomes absolutely essential and in some cases a matter of life or death. PSE must put high priority on improving the local networks before expenditure on long distance transmission projects and certainly they should not increase the consumer rates if they are not providing a 99.9% availability, that many other cities and utility companies provide today.</p>
	TIMOTHY j TUURA	Web	This is the very definition of price gouging. Corporate profits are what is causing inflation to skyrocket. My gas prices were raised 10% two years ago. This a very bad time to raise prices and by an obscene amount. This not a one year price increase but a 16% hike over 3 years. This increase needs to be scaled back dramatically.
	Lynn Billington	Web	Please do not raise the rates of our electricity any time soon. We are working to pay our other bills that have all increased including food and gas. I appreciate your attention to this matter. There are many families struggling right now and we should not add to struggles. Thank you
	Lynn Putnam	Web	I would like the UTC to only grant PSE's requested rate hike if PSE is going to use the money to improve our infrastructure to prepare the grid for all the electric cars and other electricity uses that are coming online. I've talked to several people who are skeptical that a Canadian company has our best interests at heart. Some suspect it's their teachers' union. It's up to the Commission to look out for Washington residents so that we'll have clean, safe, and adequate power into the future. Thank you. Lynn Putnam
	Peter Spairring	Web	There should be no rate hikes and if any allowed they should be much smaller. The current inflation is mostly false inflation caused by the increased cost of transportation. Once America returns to drilling and pumping oil like it can the cost of transportation will drop and the cost of goods will follow. Don't give PSE or Tacoma Power a blank check for something that is going to return back to the way it was.

	Alexandra Wiley	Web	<p>PSE has made a profit for decades and should be obligated to transition to clean energy without passing the costs on to their customers.</p> <p>PSE is requesting an increase in authorized Return on Equity (ROE) from 9.4% to 9.9%. This is not sustainable for their rate payers and is an exceedingly high guaranteed return.</p> <p>During this time of exceedingly high inflation, it is incumbent on government agencies to reign in increased profiteering by corporations.</p> <p>The Washington State Attorney General (AGO) has provided expert testimony to OPPOSE this rate increase. ( <a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista">https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/attorney-general-opposes-rate-increase-requests-puget-sound-energy-avista</a> )</p> <p>AGO's experts determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified.</p> <p>PSE is asking to increase its profit to nearly 10 percent</p> <p>The experts also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers, being approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates</p>
	Sean Armitage	Web	<p>Now is not the time to be raising electricity rates. With inflation and coming out of the pandemic we need to hold on this types of changes. While I appreciate all of the green energy initiatives PSE is embarking on and understand our energy infrastructure needs work we need to pause until inflation is under control and other normal costs return to normal.</p>
	Jon Gorski	Web	<p>I'm not opposed to rate increases that are more aligned with normal inflation (2%-3%). That is expected and anticipated. The increase PSE is requesting for 2023 is well beyond that measure. I do recognize we are experiencing high inflation this year, but the expectation is that this will come down over the long term. This 2023 jump seems to be taking advantage of this year's high inflation.</p> <p>I would also like to better understand how this increase in funds will be spent and why residential customers will be bearing the brunt of the increase. Per the rate increase, residential customers will have a larger increase than the expected average. To me this would mean, commercial and industrial customers will not have a similar increase.</p> <p>Lastly, I worry that a large increase like the one proposed for 2023 will have a massive impact on lower income families. This is a charge and increase they cannot absorb. I would recommend pushing increases out over a longer period. One that would match or closer to their financing arrangement for the capital projects they wish to recover costs. As PSE mentioned, they are looking to recover capital investment for their projects. I do not think customers should be paying at a much faster rate than the company is required with their lenders.</p>
	Jennifer Hampton	Web	<p>I do not support PSE increasing rates to increase their dividends. Utilities are such that they should not being making more than the bare minimum to stay operational.</p> <p>Docket UE-220066</p>
	Henry Corscadden	Web	<p>Once again, big corporate with out of state owners prevails over the voting and tax paying citizens who live in Washington State. The eyesore now being erected will last for a lifetime, scarring the beauty of Bellevue for no reason, other than corporate profits. The power line should have been buried if it was truly required -</p>

			the latter element never having been objectively established. More shameful conduct by government officials "[who] can't do anything" because corporations have "rights." And people (primarily politicians and bureaucrats) wonder why citizens of all political persuasions are fed up with government . . .
Ian Morris	Web		<p>Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate hike is outlandish and severe. This utility company has a monopoly on the gas and electricity in my area and will be forcing extremely high cost increases that will be felt by all, including those who can just barely makes ends meet. Their numbers are ridiculous-15.80% increase electricity and 12.98% Natural gas increase on year one?! Their reasoning includes "increase PSE's authorized return on equity!" Another case of Wall Street greed taken off the backs of the average citizen. I urge you to deny this rate increase in every way. Thank you,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ian Morris</p>
Sallie Burhans	Web		<p>Puget Sound Energy, a public utility, is failing their fiduciary responsibility to provide the lowest cost energy to consumers. Furthermore, State and Federal mandates on all their investments are affecting the cost of energy generation, thereby raising our rates.</p>
Veronica Wisniewski	Web		<p>I am writing to oppose PSE's request to increase its guaranteed profits from 9.4 to 9.9%. At a time when inflation is eating into the budget of many of their customers this increase is unconscionable.</p> <p>I currently provide PSE on average with about 1000 kw hours of surplus solar power that I produce yearly for which I do not use receive any compensation, and I am not alone. Most of that is provided during summer when demand is high and the marginal kWh is at a premium. So while PSE makes money off of my surplus power, they also want to charge me and other Washingtonians for more for the privilege of doing so. Please DO NOT honor their request.</p>
George Lawrence	Web		<p>Corporations which are regulated by the UTC cannot be allowed to raise rates in lockstep with inflation, as this not only affects cash-strapped customers but also does not assist in reining inflation. This may not please a private, profit-driven corporation, but given their 'natural monopoly' they must accept the regulation and control by the UTC. Do not let PSE receive an exorbitant rate of return during this period of inflation.</p>
Randy Hein	Web		<p>My wife and I are retired and oppose the PSE rate increases for electric power and natural gas. The increase is unnecessary and will adversely impact low and middle income ratepayers. PSE should decrease spending on their green agenda and maintain the current rates. Please do not approve the proposed rate increases.</p> <p>Thank you        Randy and Deleda Hein        Ferndale</p>
Tina Duffer	Web		<p>Referring to: Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>I oppose the substantial increases in both electricity and natural gas. This increase will be such a financial</p>

			<p>burden on us, as well as everyone else who is trying to navigate their way through this inflation. We are getting hit from all sides with increases and this double-digit increase seems excessive and will cause some to go under.</p> <p>Please consider making this more bearable on your consumers.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Tina Duffer</p>
	Rahul Kapoor	Web	<p>PSE didn't properly establish the need for Energize Eastside, nor did they explore modern safer alternatives which have been adopted in other states, so they shouldn't be allowed to go ahead with the rate increase for Energize Eastside.</p>
	Etienne Zack	Web	<p>This increase in price of energy will contribute even more to slow down the economy. In the medium term families will have to make the difficult choice to be cold or in the worse case scenario become homeless as inflation is affecting every sector of the market.</p>
	Ruth Lipscomb	Web	<p>Regarding Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067.</p> <p>Please do not increase the profit margin allowed by PSE in their proposed rate hike. There's no reason that a monopoly should be guaranteed a nearly 10% profit when their customers and other businesses are struggling to get by. They should also not be able to charge for infrastructure (Energize Eastside) that is not yet available to serve their customers and which is not even fully approved.</p> <p>Please reject this entire rate hike and send PSE back to the drawing board to come up with a more reasonable request.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
	Ross Marquardt	Web	<p>I do not have the information or expertise to judge if the proposals for substantial rate increases for residential electricity and gas customers due to decarbonization costs, capital operating costs, and future capital investments is warranted. I can accept they are.</p> <p>However, I do not accept that an increase of guaranteed profit from 9.4% to 9.9% is warranted. The Standard and Poors 500 year to date return is -13.34%. My credit union account pays 0.15% The Standard and Poors 500 year to date return is -13.34%. My credit union account pays 0.15%</p>
	David Strich	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066</p> <p>Not in favor of this rate adjustment</p> <p>PSE requests rate adjustment "to recover more than four years of capital and operating investments made on behalf of customers and not currently included in PSE's rates" and "to recover increased oprtating costs."</p> <p>It seems contrary to responsible company growth and development to make investments and then to ask for the money to back the work. It seems more appropriate that PSE should have asked for investment and commitment to raise rates BEFORE spending four years worth of investment money that it is now requesting. This is a poor time to ask for an increase of such major magnitude given inflationary economic conditions and over 13% increase will certainly press families to dire conditions. I disagree with this proposal</p>



			for poor timing of the ask, the size of the immediate increase, and an understanding that PSE spent money without asking for permission and now wants to be paid back.
	Julia Flanagan	Web	I strongly appose the increase in guaranteed profit for PSE. I am a working mother and my budget is stretched thin from the cost of rent, food, gas, and child care. There's no reason my energy bill should go up by \$12/month so that shareholders can make a larger profit.
	Vickie Skelton	Web	(Comments were received via the consumer protection phone and are typed verbatim by Sam Cooper) - I am not in favor the rates are too high with inflation and property tax increasing, these rate hikes are just too high for the state, for the way we are taxed. Mmh hmh. And that's all.
	CHANDRA SRINIVASAN	Web	Cost of living in Seattle is already skyrocketing like anything. Rental prices, food, transportation is unaffordable. Now on top of it the rare increase for electricity and gas by PSE is unacceptable. Let's find another company for our power needs.
	Kathy Starbuck	Web	(Comments typed verbatim at request of customer per call to consumer program line on 7/28/2022, 2:52 p.m. by Sam Cooper) We understand that the power company has made rate hikes in the past, but this proposed one for 2023 seems so high, 12% minimum, that seems that it's going to be quite a hardship for so many people. Considering inflation and everything else going on, and so many prices going up. Please rethink such a large increase, a smaller increase would be appreciated.
	Susan Nyman	Web	The residential rates are gong up 15.80! I am on social security and a small pension. if we get an 8% raise, that still leaves me short almost 8%. You are asking for huge increases. I cannot do solar as I have too much shade from trees not on my property. i put in a heat pump which helps heat, ,but it doesn't nearly help reduce costs compared to what you are asking. are there ways to tier the increases based on age or income? thank you.
	Luke Hemarga	Web	Rate increased are not justifiable since it is asking 16.34% in 2023, 2.68% in 2024 and 1.23% in 2025. Consumer doe not have extra 20% income that PSE seeking and this increase are aim to have higher profit only. PSE should reduce rate to help consumer at during this difficult time instead of adding burden to consumer. Would appreciate for PSE to re-think this and work towards helping consumer instead of thinking of having higher profits. Thank you
	Chelsea Icoz	Web	According to page 12 of their latest 10Q they are making about a 25% net profit. It's ludacris that they need a 15% raise in rates unless their cost of buying electricity has gone up 30% or something like that. Maybe I'm missing something, because they say their current authorized return on equity is 9.4%. First: I would love to have a steady return on investment of 9.4%. Second: who thinks it's okay for them to get even more than that? Utilities should not be a high profit sector. They should be boringly reliable. They clearly don't need to be more profitable to attract investment.

	Steven Hernandez	Web	<p>They make enough damn money. Their costs on page 12 indicate they have a large amount of profit given their operating revenue compared to their operating budget. so i fail to understand why they need a 15% increase in rates unless they poorly mismanged things (<a href="https://www.pse.com/-/media/PDFs/PugetEnergy/PE-10Q-20220331.pdf">https://www.pse.com/-/media/PDFs/PugetEnergy/PE-10Q-20220331.pdf</a>) and their first proposal in march was less (<a href="https://www.pse.com/press-release/details/Puget-Sound-Energy-files-three-year-rate-proposal">https://www.pse.com/press-release/details/Puget-Sound-Energy-files-three-year-rate-proposal</a>) so it feels like despite the war erupting at that time, they didn't forsee impacts that have clearly played out.</p> <p>At this point the company should be providing service more close to even than to expand their profits further as they are a UTILITIES company. Don't give them anything, ask them to start contributing more to lighten everyone's load.</p>
	DAWN PEHL	Web	<p>Re: Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>We received notice of the requested rate changes, and were disgusted. During a time when our economy is already suffering and people are struggling to keep gas in their cars and food on their tables, a proposed increase of 13.59% for Electric Service and 12.98% for Natural Gas Service for 2023 is ridiculous. On top of that, the proposed increases for 2024 and 2025 are less than 3%. None of the reasons that PSE have given to justify the request for the increases balance out the damage this will cause many families and households. While we understand that rate increases are inevitable, this rate of increase in such a small period of time is too much to ask. We hope that you will seriously consider this when you make your decision to approve or reject these changes. Thank you.</p>
	Kevin Dominik Korte	Web	<p>The current rate increase proposal is beyond good and evil. At almost 13% the support for low income customers is becomming a self fulfilling prophecy.</p> <p>At the same time the energy infrastructure improvements should already be covered by the demand for electricity going up. After all, why build Energize Eastside, if the lines are not needed? PSE UP &amp; Go is not free for energy customers. Why should home owners and small business pay for PSE building a revenue generating charging network? The current metering infrastructure is not technically broken. Why should customers pay for a replacement, that only reduces staffing need and pads PSE's revenue? Constrasting to the press release, there is no incentive program for customers to get roof top solar. Thus, the statement is at best misleading and at worst a lie. All in all there is little reason for the rate increase except for PSE's bottom line.</p>
	Melissa Flynn	Web	<p>PSE does not provide a reasonable explanation for the proposed &gt;10% increase in electricity &amp; natural gas rates next year. It is clear that PSE is only looking to increase their profits to the detriment of consumers that have no other choice but PSE for their electricity and natural gas. PSE currently is getting just over 9% back on investments that tax payers funded. PSE should be held liable for their poor planning (not investing in green energy sooner) and should NOT be getting another bail out from tax payers - this should be a business expense they pay out from their currently overflowing coffers.</p>
	barbara norman	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066:</p> <p>I was hoping to retire as I will be 66 yeas old. I can not do so if I have to expect another increase in basic cost of living, along with the cost of gas and food, etc. I will either have to change to firewood, or some kind</p>

			<p>of pellet stove as the cost for heat is getting to where a homeowner can not afford basics. I am a bit in shock that with all that's been going on with our economy, that PSE is choosing at this time, to increase our rates 15.8 % . I don't get a 2% increase at my job in 3 years yet cost are going up regardless. I think many people are headed for becoming independent as much as possible from PSE or will have government overseeing helping get payments made, so bigger government. For what its worth, I am an unhappy customer.</p>
	Marie Phipps	Web	As a senior citizen on a fixed income, another rate increase would really hurt.
	Melodie Loughmuller	Web	Not in favor of the rate increase. It should be a more gradual increase if approved, more affordable.
	Daniel A. Wright	Web	<p>Docket UE-220066 and Docket UG-220067</p> <p>I am opposed to the rate increases requested by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The requested rate increases are exorbitant, and inflationary.</p> <p>PSE says the rate increases are 13.59% and 12.98%. This not entirely accurate. On the proposal sheet, PSE explicitly states that the rate increase for residential customers for the first year is 16.34%.</p> <p>PSE is asking to increase rates to recover four years of capital and operating investments which are not included in current rates. PSE should have address their neglect of this issue.</p> <p>PSE also is requesting an increase in return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. This should be denied. If anything, the rate should be reduced below 9.4%.</p> <p>PSE is a monopoly. That should be a free pass to raise capital and rates from the consumers who have to purchase their electricity and natural gas from PSE.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission should not be a rubber stamp the regulated industries. These rate increases will have a crushing impact on people with limited incomes. There are other programs to assist seniors and disabled people, viz., reduced property tax rates and public utilities. PSE should do the same.</p>
	Suzanne Hensler	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>They're proposing nearly 20% electric increase in electric bills in an economy that is suffering. Not everyone works for Microsoft and can afford this increase. The middle class is being squeezed for high food prices, high gas prices, then you guys wanna tack this on right after Christmas. I think its not fair to a lot of individuals.</p>

	Nancy	Web	PSE wants to increase power rates by 13.6% - 15.8% beginning Jan. 1, 2023. I understand that costs are increasing for everything but this rate hike is extensive and unnecessary. This increase will impact a lot of families who are already struggling. Families need electricity for work, school, cooking, heat, etc.PSE does not need to increase rates by this much or at all. Please stop this increase. We can't afford this rate hike.
	Randall Punt	Web	I'm a senior on a fixed income. I'm already paying 60% more at the grocery store, prices have almost doubled at the gas station, and property taxes are through the roof. We are in a recession due to the lack of leadership at our state and federal level. It's very difficult to get by. I and many other citizens can't afford a 20% increase in electricity and 16% increase on natural gas over the next three years. PSE is very profitable already. I feel you're being greedy and trying to take advantage of the current economic situation and the citizens that have to use your services. Thank you.
	Lynn Hajnal	Web	PSE's proposed price increases for 2023 are OUTRAGEOUS!! What company gouges their consumers at 12.9% for electricity and 11.9% for natural gas within one year? And proposes additional increase in 2024 & 2025?  This increase is unconscionable and places severe hardship on seniors and those of low income. And then to read the CEO makes 5 million? Unreal...  Please respond and let me know something can be done.
	Alex DeCoy	Web	You guys are trying to rob residents blind. PSE has made 25% profit in their last 10Q, seems kind of weird that you need a 15% raise in rates. Yet you have a 9.4% equity return, must be nice to be a rich scum bag like PSE. You are a fucking utility, not some God. YOU should NOT be a high profit sector, if anything you need to be boringly reliable. Quit trying to rob us. You do not need to be more profitable to attract investment.
	Jason Pittman	Web	Utility bills are high enough as they are, we do not need any significant rate increases for gas or electric rates. Especially right now as inflation is at 40 year record high amounts.
	Ronald E Kirby	Web	Re UE 22066 and UG 220067: although I am not opposed to infrastructure requirements I am adamantly opposed to the proposed return on equity for both services. These values are far in excess of what is reasonable for public utilities.
	rob carter	Web	I have seen how wasteful the company spends its money and I'm tired of being a cash machine they can ring everytime they need more cash. Let them streamline and stop spending millions on unused office space and stupid multimedia productions for stuff that should be in a powerpoint.
	William Jaques	Web	These are my comments on the requested changes to electric and natural gas rates on Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.  I believe the rate increases proposed are excessive and downright demeaning. The cost of electricity and natural gas has not increased nearly as much as the proposed rate increases, and the company is making an exorbitant amount of profit as demonstrated by the extravagant salaries of executives (and probably

			<p>employees). They need to get their house in order and bring down internal costs instead of sticking it to their customers. They essentially have a monopoly on energy in this area and that is why a private foreign company bought PSE in the first place. Those of us who are on fixed incomes do not have a choice of using less and less energy to survive and the UTC has as an obligation to deny approval of such an exorbitant rate increase. See below the windfall salaries of executives on the back of us common people. There are many more managers who make an exorbitant salary who many not even be needed. What ever happened to lean management? We just cannot afford these big increases.</p> <p>As President and Chief Executive Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Mary E. Kipp made \$2,942,831 in total compensation in 2019, \$5,296,566 in 2020, and \$4,414,245 in 2021 with a pay ratio of 34:1.</p> <p>As Former Senior Vice President Chief Financial Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Daniel A. Doyle made \$2,193,609 in total compensation in 2019, \$1,909,022 in 2020, and \$1,286,597 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Kazi Hasan made \$1,116,080 in total compensation in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President, Chief Operations Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Booga K. Gilbertson made \$1,333,686 in total compensation in 2020, and \$1,122,110 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President Shared Services and CIO at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Margaret F. Hopkins made \$845,652 in total compensation in 2020, and \$819,748 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President, General Counsel, Chief Ethics &amp; Compliance Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Steve R. Secrist made \$1,636,062 in total compensation in 2020, and \$1,374,934 in 2021.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President Regulatory and Strategy at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Adrian J. Rodriguez made \$1,316,682 in total compensation in 2021.</p> <p>Thank you for your support in this matter, William Jaques Snohomish, WA</p>
	Heather Wong	Web	In an already overpriced market, with inflation and rising property squeezing blood out of pocketbooks, PSE's proposal for 13% rate hikes on both electric and natural gas is absurd. Employers are not giving raises any where near (or if any at all) that percentage. The high of a rate increase will literally displace people from

			their homes. Most are living paycheck to paycheck already. Now they are asking us to chose between power and dinner.
Paul R. Detmer	Web		<p>I must strongly protest PSE's most recent gas increase proposal. They just had an over 8% increase in 2020 and have increased their corporate profits and senior management salaries and stock awards. Their excuse that costs are increasing and they "need" and increase of this magnitude (12.15%) is absurd and not grounded in reality. Please force them to reduce this increase to a reasonable level that reflects the actual costs they will be incurring and force them to scale back their obscene profit taking at the expense of the rate payers (us).</p> <p>Thank you. Paul R. Detmer, Ph.D.</p>
Nancy Evans	Web		I'm a senior citizen and on a fixed income. The proposed rate increase isn't affordable for me. Why does a company need a 25% profit? They have a monopoly so I can't get another supplier.
Denise McJunkin	Web		The increases just add more to an already burdened people. More and more is being pushed to electric and we are paying even more \$.
Jane Doe	Web		<p>Taken by CTC (*NOTE: The customer refused to provide a legitimate name or any identifying information)</p> <p>I'm on a fixed income and with all the prices rising everywhere, you know; my income doesn't raise every year. If I'm lucky, it raises one percent. PSE is raising by 15 percent the first year. I'll be put out of house and home. Either raise the rates a lot slower or something, because it's going to affect a whole lot of us that are in my position.</p>
Steve Shimizu	Web		Social Security raised my check by 6% but Medicare premiums increased by 10%. I'm just finding it hard, luckily I'm not able to drive, so I'm not having to pay \$6 per gallon for gas. I have noticed that the cost of meat has gone up, and luckily I had saved and eating out of my freezer right now. These sorts of increases are really affecting what I can do and how much house help I can get. I appreciate the time to be able to comment to Puget Sound Energy rates and thank you very much for taking my comment.
Gordon Smith	Web		12.15% increase.... You've got to be kidding... You can't convince me this reflects an unmet need for additional revenues for a commodity they control... Inflationary and obscene... I'm changing my natural gas supplier... Oh right... They're the only game in town 🙄
Matthew McCoy	Web		The proposal is outrageous. A 13% increase in 2023 when inflation is already running at historic rates? This is showing a clear betrayal of public trust and makes me believe that natural gas service needs to be city owned. It is time that corporations make the same sacrifices that us regular people make. The current 9.4% equity return is already far too high. If PSE needs \$ to make capital investments, the "return on equity" needs to be trimmed in half. There is no real justification for the return. If a Democratic governor appoints commisioners who ok such a ridiculous increase, it will further paint the Democrats as out of touch with working people in this state.

	BRIGITTA JONES	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066/UG-220067</p> <p>I am requesting you deny PSE request for a rate increase. PSE energy just did a rate increase at the beginning of this year and with everything i.e. vehicle gas, groceries, insurance, utilities all going up at the same time year, families are already struggling to keep up with the rising costs. Another increase would hurt working class families. This is not the time for another increase.</p>
	Reilly Hearne	Web	<p>The rates I pay in my 500 square foot home are already unbelievably high. \$200 minimum per bill cycle with the refrigerator and water heater as the only electric appliances, and lights are never on. On top of very high rates (or maybe they just overestimate the meter) they randomly charge large amounts( \$400+) on top of the usage fees and refuse to itemize or explain what they are for. This company needs a close watch</p>
	Marcia Engstrom	Web	<p>Does the UTC every deny a request for utility increase?</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) has sent a "Notice of requested changes to PSE rates" letter. As a consumer, this letter really means "Notice of PSE rate increase."</p> <p>In this letter, PSE indicates a rate increase next year will generate an additional \$143 million in revenue to reimburse themselves for capital and operating expenses from the past four years, to increase their return on equity by 0.5%, and to fund upcoming capital and operating expenses.</p> <p>By the time PSE submits another Notice for UTC hearing in the future, no one will remember that this increase was to fund future capital and operating expenses. PSE wants their cake and eat it too by seeking customers to pick up the tab for increased operating costs while also increasing their return on equity. Customer bank accounts do not have that option - if expenses increase, then equity returns decrease.</p> <p>PSE is asking for too much at the wrong time in the US economy. Please deny their request for gas rate increase of 12.98%.</p>
	Dominique Coulet du Gard	Web	<p>At most, the utility company, Puget Sound Energy, should not raise more than the percentage of our US inflation which is about 9.5% Why more than that? It makes no sense. We cannot be carrying this burden. Look at your budget, look at all the lines of your budget and cut some of it.</p> <p>Thanks,          Dominique Coulet du Gard</p>
	Mark Abney	Web	<p>PSE should not raise rates on a needed utility in order to "increase profit margin" their listed margin is already higher than it should be. Frankly electricity should be public utility not private for profit.</p>
	Jane Hudson	Web	<p>I understand that everything is being effected by the current economy but at 13% increase is going to hurt so many in fixed incomes and when costs go down the rates will not be adjusted back down. A 13% increase is beyond inflation rates and can't be sustained by many consumers. PSE should look at other ways to cut costs in upper management rather than pass it in to customers at this exorbitant increase!</p>

	John H Thomas	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066 and 22067 The requested 2023 rate increases are ridiculous - 15.8% and 12.15% for consumers. It's hard for me to imagine that you are serious about such a tone-deaf proposal in light of the inflationary pressures on the average consumer. I also believe your justifications are nonsensical. Don't your costs generally include providing safe and reliable energy? Am I to believe you haven't been providing that in the past or that there are mitigating factors that are so far above normal annual increases? Am I also led to believe that the expenses associated with "decarbonization" (a ridiculous notion as even solar and wind generation depend on carbon) are that much more expensive than other "carbonized" means of power generation such as hydro, gas and coal? I could go through each of the points listed as "reasons" which read like spin generated by marketing rather than defensible business justification to justify an increase so far beyond increases in normal operating expenses. Lastly, I see no justification to increase the ROE from 9.4% to 9.9% --- that is meaningless to me as a consumer of your services. <b>IN SUMMARY:</b> This proposal is out of touch with the current experience of the average consumer and it feels like a "shoot for the moon" request that it should embarrass the management.</p>
	Robby	Web	<p>This comment is in regards to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>At a time when consumers are already pressed by a rough inflation-laden economy, a nearly 20% increase of utility bills is an unnecessary burden on the residents of the Puget Sound area.</p> <p>PSE should be looking into ways to be more efficient with their finances, rather than push for increasing returns when many consumers are already having trouble making ends meet. PSE's existing programs already do not sufficiently mitigate the costs incurred to lower and middle income families in the area.</p> <p>Our region is in the midst of an affordability crises, and runaway spending like this proposal is only worsening it.</p>
	Susan Corcadden	Web	<p>What PSE is doing to South Bellevue is <b>OUTRAGEOUS</b>. Imagine living in your home for 40 years, with a breathtaking view of Seattle that now has <b>MASSIVE</b> electrical poles and large cabling completely destroying the vista. How in the world can this happen in this day and age--allowing PSE to put such outdated technology in, with no regards to homeowners property values or general beauty of the area is truly unfathomable. Bellevue is so greedy --no surprise the city rolled-over for PSE--and now PSE wants to jack prices. Every single day we now look out the window and it's a gut punch. Hope those who approved this understand how much they screwed residents of this city. You all should be completely ashamed, but hey if it doesn't affect you, you clearly don't have to care.</p>
	Ronald Collins	Web	<p>I understand that we are in the midst of the rape of America. However, the governing bodies should see that there is a limit to what the economy can bear. I do not object to reasonable rate increases to cover rising operating costs. PSE's proposal goes too far. We are looking at an average residential increase of 10.62% for electricity and 16.08 % for natural gas. I am a former state employee and I received a 3% retirement pay increase this year. Why should PSE need more than Me? Someone must slow the rape down. If you don't</p>



			slow it down, there will be no America left to rape. The population can bear only so much. If your intent is to finish the job of making the U.S. a third world nation, this is an easy way to push the project along. Stop it!!
	Ann-Marie Olive	Web	This is excessive and will put most PSE customers in serious financial strain. With all of the excessive cost increases lately, there are so many that cannot pay for the basic things they need to live and work. There will be a massive amount of people that will not be able to use their electric heat, appliances to prepare a meal, hot water, etc. This is not okay. This is not the time for a rate increase of any kind. PSE has a monopoly and is using that to line their pockets. This cannot be allowed!
	K Fejarang	Web	<p>I think it's terrible that PSE is suggesting they need a 12.92% rate increase for residential electricity. I understand they outline all kinds of reasons; however, numbers can be manipulated so the company can show what they want. This is the problem with an investor owned utilities, they're focus is making money for their investors. They need to find ways to cut their expenditures without increases rates like this.</p> <p>Washington customers have no choice with who is their electric company. Unless you move, but who can afford that?</p> <p>PSE already has outrageous rates compared to Tacoma Power. PSE is going to hurt a lot of families when they raise rates like they propose. Please look at this carefully.</p>
	Adria Moskowitz	Web	<p>PSE has been raising rates every year, while claiming they "are not" raising rates. They install equipment, "temporarily" raise our rates to pay for the new equipment, then refuse to lower the rates. They have been doing this for years. They charge customers extra to pay for changing the whole system over to renewable energy resources, claiming customers will get credit for paying into the change-over. There have been no credits, nor a system-wide change-over. They have been doing this for years as well. Now they plan to raise rates another 17%. This is offensive.</p> <p>They should not have a 17% rate increase. They should lower rates to the level they were before the 3 "temporary" rate increases (the lowest of which was about 5%) before discussing any other rate increases. Or they should just keep the rates as they are for the next 3 years for their "Permanent" rate increase.</p>
	Hillary Parker	Web	Raising revenue 13% after making \$360M as reported in your 2021 10K is ridiculous. Justification to cover capital improvement for the last 4 years? Cashflow seems more than enough to cover those investments already. Shame on you!
	Michael L Fuller	Web	My comments refer to PSE's proposed electric and gas rate increase which was submitted on January 31, 2022. This proposal could not come at a more challenging time in our economy. So many families are being impacted by record high inflation to include fuel costs and now PSE wants to hop on the bandwagon. An overall increase of 13.59% (electricity) and 12.98% (gas) is beyond even the current inflation rate. I am on a fixed income. My income is not adjusted as prices increase. I am asking that the UTC think in terms of the common man and woman and not the shareholders of PSE.

	Heidi Carrell	Web	<p>Regarding Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067, I hope the UTC will approve a lower rate increase than is proposed. With high inflation and the past few winters being particularly cold and snowy, a 12-13% rate increase could mean some residents cannot afford to stay warm this winter. Instead of a 12-13% increase this year and 2% increases for 2024 and 2025, a plan that would spread the cost out with 5-6% each year would allow PSE to raise the same amount of funds, while allowing customers to be able to adjust their personal budgets accordingly.</p>
	Mark Massie	Web	<p>If you continue to punish fossil fuels in 20 billion new taxes for your green new fantasy. The consumer will pay dearly for this craziness. We the people will vote all green deal fanatics out of office.</p>
	BILL ECKEL	Web	<p>I'm the classic retiree - retired 13 years ago - and my fixed income just doesn't stretch as far as it used to. In the face of the once-in-a-generation inflation that's currently gouging out holes in my income, PSE now wants to increase costs for an essential service over 17% in the next 3 years. Why does it have to be front-loaded so much? Can't the increases be spread more evenly? I certainly support safe and reliable electricity generation and delivery as well as de-carbonizing the system. I can't really technically criticize the proposed capital program or find savings in their operating costs, but gosh, increasing their guaranteed rate of return in a monopoly market another 5% to almost 10%, whoa! I don't know anybody who's making 10% on investments these days. I do not support the proposed rates. Thank you.</p>
	Zachary	Web	<p>PSE, Puget Sound Energy, announced that it will be seeking increases in rates for electric and gas service by 10-15% over the next several years - but mostly with dramatic increases of 15.8% and 12.15% respectively in just the next year. This exploitation, coming at a time of dramatic inflation and surging costs across nearly all services, will place undue hardship on households barely getting by and with no market options outside of this foreign-owned monopoly. PSE must not increase its rates beyond the rate of inflation, and in fact profits on such necessary services should absolutely be capped, and capped low. Until this monopoly is broken, attempts at price gouging must be forbidden.</p>
	Steven Storms	Web	<p>The LNG facility built by Puget Sound Energy for TOTE has been an absolute disaster from the start. PSE is a public facility that should not have been allowed to build a for profit plant to begin with. At the time it was proposed, TOTE was looking for the cheapest fuel they could find and natural gas and LNG was very favorably priced. In order to get the permit, they had to use the most favorable assumptions and even then, it barely was able to show any environmental benefit. The world needs to drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions to as close to zero as possible. The minuscule reduction they quoted is of absolutely no benefit to the drastic reductions required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The original project was estimated to be \$275 million, with an estimated \$37 million in Net Present Value. This gives a simple return of 13.45% return. (<math>\\$35M/\\$275M = 13.45\%</math>) This is a fair return for a public utility.</li> <li>- The cost escalated by \$35M to \$310 million. This reduced the NPV to by the same amount to \$2 million. This gives a simple return of 0.65% return. (<math>\\$2M/\\$310M = 0.65\%</math>) This is indicative of a poor project that should never be funded.</li> <li>- Instead, PSE requested that public pay a large portion of the cost on a project that was not financially</li> </ul>

		<p>justifiable. Their analysis indicated that the public should pay for 43% of the cost, which was \$133 million. This reduced the cost to PSE to only \$177 million. (<math>\\$310 - \\$133M = \\$177</math>) The new calculation shows that PSE was only required to invest \$177 million. The \$133 million from the public was added directly to the \$2 million NPV for a total of \$135 million. The simple Return on Investment increased to an astronomical 76.27%. (<math>\\$135M/\\$177M = 76.27\%</math>)</p> <p>While PSE touted the benefits to the public, only TOTE, PSE and the City of Tacoma received any financial rewards. The public actually saw increases in prices.</p> <p>I do not know the details of the contract with TOTE, but natural gas and LNG are at record highs. The decision to build the LNG plant must look like a terrible mistake. Now they are trying to pass the costs onto the residential customers again. They originally decided to pursue a project that was not financially viable. They said they would not do it by themselves due to risk. It has only gotten worse. The owners should be made to live with the decision to build a for profit facility. The public did not ask for the facility. The public did not receive any of the financial benefits when there was a profit. The public was forced to accept the original terms, but we should not be forced accept even more abuse. PSE asked to spit the company to become a for profit entity. The public should not bail them out when it goes bad. A public utility does not support losses from a private company.</p> <p>Do not approve a rate hike! Protect the consumer from bad decisions from the private portion of PSE.</p> <p>Steven Storms        BSChE - PE (retired)</p>
Ellen Fossett	Web	<p>PSE's plans to increase power rates by 13.6% - 15.8% beginning Jan. 1, 2023 is unfathomable. I understand the cost of everything is increasing but this is far too steep of an increase. I would struggle to pay my bills with this, and I don't use that much energy. Please do something about this!!!</p>
Bob Houde	Web	<p>I cannot even believe that PSE would request such an unfair amount of an increase for electricity of 15.80 % in one year let alone thinking that UTC would even consider it ! That amount of increase is just completely ridiculous, maybe they should cut back on buying all of those fancy new trucks and having to many people sitting in them while one guy is working. I've worked in the construction industry for over 30 years and have witnessed firsthand the excessive waste of labor hours and fleecing by the hands of PSE. 3% increase acceptable if they prove they need it.</p>
Alan Tomaszycski	Web	<p>I understand rates need to increase however the approach is extreme. Why not divide the rate increase evenly over the years to not burden the every day users so much. 15 percent is way to much in a year. There is no reason to go to that extreme.</p>
Will Lockwood	Web	<p>Our family is opposed to the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) rate hike proposal. The stated reasons for the increase are disingenuous. PSE is a gas company that relies mostly on natural gas to provide power. This is</p>

			<p>not clean energy nor is it carbon-neutral. In their 10 yr plan they do not demonstrate a clear path toward replacing gas plants with renewables. In a region with abundant geothermal resources they still have no geothermal power generation. They also do not have large scale solar/wind/battery systems like Portland General Electric's WheatBridge project.</p> <p>Additionally, ratepayers should not be asked to improve shareholder value and return on equity, period.</p> <p>We are a fixed income family that has done its best to reduce carbon emissions. A rate increase of this magnitude will have negative impact at a time when inflation, high property taxes, and medical bills leave little room for an increase in the electrical bill. Please say no to this rate increase request by PSE.</p>
	Wayne Ude	Web	<p>Their service isn't very good--far too many power outages each year. Profits are high. Let them make their lines a lot more secure (with underground lines wherever possible) before you consider any rate increases. Prices are high enough as it is, and as a public commission, you should have the good of the consumers in mind ahead of those of stockholders.</p>
	Curtis Allred	Web	<p>In UE-220066 and UG-2200067 PSE is asking for a nearly 20% rate increase to line the pockets of its shareholders. I believe the projects they are using to justify the rate increase were not justified and are not needed to improve reliability. Tacoma LNG plant and Energize Eastside are examples of projects where they coerced and threatened city governments and ignored cries of the public in order to force the projects through.</p> <p>These projects also do nothing to put PSE on the path to CETA compliance.</p> <p>PSE customers already pay among the highest rates in the state for energy. How can they have the audacity to ask for more?</p> <p>PSE cannot be allowed to keep charging us more and more to destroy our environment and increase our CO2 emissions, just to appease their shareholders.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my view.</p>
	John & Maggie Stasny	Web	<p>This rate increase is totally WRONG, why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Seniors on SSI only received a 5.9% raise.</li><li>2) That 5.9% SSI raise was all &amp; then some taken back by the increase of Medicare (\$144 to\$170+/month)</li><li>3) We are in an inflationary time where Seniors income has NOT kept up with Energy cost, &amp; the necessities of living.</li><li>4) This will force the cost of Silverdale water to increase &amp; all other services, products, &amp; transportation to increase.</li><li>5) Seniors trying to live out their last days in their homes, will be forced out. Is that your intent????</li></ol>

			<p>6) We are oil heat, with 2 empty tanks that can not afford to fill. The gas line stops 750' north of us &amp; 13 years ago would cost over \$5,000 to get it to our home + all the appliances that need to be changed out.</p> <p>7) Electric inferred is our back up &amp; with empty oil tanks. Is now our primary heat source.</p> <p>8) We are in our mid 70's &amp; wood cutting is not an option anymore. That could invite a heart attack !!!</p> <p>9) Increasing PSE's equity to the 9.9% is far above what banks pay their savers, or what Bonds pay &amp; other financial products.</p> <p>10) Stop trying to steal what little Seniors have &amp; force them out of their homes.</p> <p>John &amp; Maggie Stasny</p>
	Michael Betz	Web	<p>I am opposed to the Puget Sound Energy is requesting an increase in guaranteed profit. Puget Sound Energy is requesting an increase in guaranteed profit from 9.4% to 9.9%. That means their shareholders are getting dividends about five times higher than the interest on the most generous bank accounts. Most of these shareholders are abroad.</p> <p>The average increase for residential service will be \$12/month in the first year, with further increases in years two and three.</p> <p>During this time of exceedingly high inflation, regulatory agencies should reign in excess corporate profits by monopolies like PSE.</p> <p>The Washington State Attorney General (AGO) is opposing this rate increase, saying PSE is exaggerating costs and seeking exorbitant rates of return.</p>
	Daniel Sandvig	Web	<p>Re: Docket UG-220067 PSE Natural Gas rate increases for years 2023,2024,2025.</p> <p>As a fixed income retired Senior Citizen, I am vehemently opposed to this rate increase! I am a PSE customer with a Natural Gas Furnace and Water Heater, and the proposed rate increases are outrageously high! Fossil Fuel Corporations are already realizing outrageously high profits, while consumers are are having to cut back on spending for their basic life sustaining needs!</p> <p>Please deny this rate increase!</p> <p>A rate increase of this magnitude, at this time, will disproportionately impact the Health and Finances of the most vulnerable citizens of Washington State, who are already overburdened by soaring taxes, medical costs, and the rapidly rising cost of food!</p> <p>Sincerely, Daniel Sandvig</p>
	Dave Peters	Web	<p>Opposed to the PSE rate increase because it is astronomical and a hardship to its customers.</p>
	David Bruce Lapham, Jr.	Web	<p>This is totally a bad time for a rate hike. We are in the midst of huge inflation, and I can't afford any more. I am retired and on a fixed income. I am having enough trouble as it is. I am trying to move to a more conservative state where things are more affordable, but it's not easy. So, yes I object to this price hike. Try</p>

			it again when the economy is better. This price hike will only feed the inflation monster that is eating me and my wife alive!
Jakub Bednarek	Web		PSE is proposing a rate increase of 15%. This is egregious as PSE made 24% profits according to their last report. What justification is there to keep increasing profits while inflation leads more and more people to tent cities. Rates should be reduced and profits capped at 10%. Make the utility sector boring and reliable; not another vaccum of capital from our community to a foreign investor.
LARRY LEE SCHRENK	Web		The asked for rate increase is hugh !Even if there is justification for such a increase there is no justification for the increase of return on equity. I feel any increases should be spread evenly across the 3 year period.
Stephanie Allen	Web		Regarding: Docket UE-220066  I oppose PSE's proposed rate increases for electricity. With rising rent, food, and gas prices, along with student loans entering repayment, my household already has enough to worry about paying for. Increasing our electric bills would only add to the burden. If PSE needs additional money to fund their transition to green energy, perhaps they can ask their shareholders to foot the bill instead of families who are already struggling.
Timothy Edgren	Web		Docket UE-220066: The requested rate increases are financially burdensome for the bulk of PSE's customers. There is no alternative for most of us, and we are not seeing a similar increase in income. Expenses everywhere are rising, but income is not. Additionally, PSE is requesting this increase to support some things that its customers do not agree with, such as decarbonization (which is not actually decarbonizing anything, it's just shifting the responsibility to others, such as wind turbine manufacturers). PSE intends to charge more for the same level of service, in order to increase its profit margin. This is all well and good for PSE's investors, but not for the average Washingtonian. I request that the UTC deny this rate increase request because it exceeds all rational standards; private companies deserve to get paid for providing goods and services at a reasonable rate, but Washingtonians deserve to have basic necessities without being taken advantage of.
Rex Clothier	Web		I believe WA has a solid energy service provided by PSE. That being said, they should have a requirement to create and implement cost savings initiatives to recover at minimum any increased operating costs and to provide for upcoming capital investments and operating cost increases into the future. Without focused discipline in these areas, we invite waste and complacency in PSE's fiduciary responsibility to provide safe and reliable energy service at a beneficial cost to it's customers. I would suggest the words "beneficial Cost" be added to PSE's mandates.  In addition, there is no reason that PSE should be allowed to increase it's authorized Return on Equity from 9.4 to 9.9%. In fact, I would suggest they be held to a higher standard to maintain a 9.4% ROE and have performance targets requirements to sustain such a high ROE. Performance targets such as cost improvement initiatives, Operating efficiency gains, Return on Invested Capital improvements, etc rather

			<p>than be allowed to simply raise Electric service rates a cumulative increase of 17.18% (not including compounding) and impacting WA consumers the incremental fees or more than 2% over that for sustained service. This is clearly a money grab rather than a valued stewardship of the right to provide electrical (and Natural Gas) services on a monopolistic basis. Please do not allow this aggressively high increase and instead review optionality to provide safe and reliable energy service in a more competitive dynamic that rewards sustainable value in Washingtons energy costs to our communities.</p>
	William Tadlock	Web	<p>Their is no viable justification to increase the cost of electricity to Washington Consumers! As a small business I can't afford any increases in over head costs! I will have to close my business if this increase is approved. Try working smarter and avoid cost increases this is what I have to do!</p>
	Milton Hammon Jr.	Web	<p>A 17.18% increase in rates over a 3 year period is exorbitant. In this period of high inflation when most people are struggling with their finances, this request from PSE should be denied.</p>
	Martha Freitag	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy requested rate changes for effect 2023          Reference Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>PSE's requested utility rate increases will fall disproportionately on the backs of residential consumers. This is at a time when we are already facing dramatically increased costs in food, transportation, healthcare, and other essential costs of living. Homeowners' property taxes have increased in the double-digits and most rental costs have as well.</p> <p>PSE is a monopoly. Yes, its business is regulated, but we residential customers, and small businesses, have no other option for our electricity and gas.</p> <p>Residential consumers should not have to bear the burden of the proposed rate increase. (The numbers that I am referring to, below, were provided by PSE in its Notice to customers provided with my monthly bill. The numbers are not complete, as they do not include the total amounts of revenue received by PSE from each source; only the rates and percentage increases in rates have been provided to us.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential users already pay the highest rates per therm for gas (\$1.18238 currently) and would continue to do so with the proposed rate of \$1.32602 for 2023. Focus is put on the rate of increase (12.16%), which is above the current rate of inflation, but the actual rates paid by residential customers would remain higher than commercial rates.</li> <li>• Residential electrical rates for 2023, projected to increase by 15.8%, would be higher than any other rate, at \$0.13246 per kW, with the exception of Lighting (area &amp; street); the latter is probably born indirectly by consumers, presuming that street lighting is paid by municipalities (via property taxes).</li> <li>• Residential consumers will eventually absorb the rate increases proposed for businesses and municipalities as well, once they are passed along through price increases for goods, services, and taxes.</li> </ul>

			<p>PSE proposes increasing its Return on Equity, a measure of its profitability, from 9.4% to 9.9%. This increase in RoE, born by rate increases to customers, is unjustified.</p> <p>PSE is a highly profitable private company. According to its Annual Report for 2021 (available on the UTC website), Net Income increased by 22.5%, from \$274 million to \$336 million in 2020. The company was able to increase its dividend payout to shareholders by 54%, to \$230 million from \$149 million in 2020.</p> <p>PSE pays its executives well (from the annual report):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>President and Chief Executive Officer Mary E. Kipp \$923,923</li> <li>2 Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Kazi Hasan \$243,409</li> <li>3 Senior Vice President Regulatory and Strategy Adrian J. Rodriguez \$475,318</li> <li>4 SVP, General Counsel and Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer Steve R. Secrist \$497,096</li> <li>5 Senior Vice President Shared Services &amp; Chief Information Officer Margaret F. Hopkins \$400,984</li> <li>6 Senior Vice President and Chief Customer Officer Andrew Wappler \$351,246</li> <li>7 Vice President Regulatory and Government Affairs Ken Johnson \$278,333</li> <li>8 Vice President Energy Supply Ron Roberts \$329,154</li> <li>9 Vice President Human Resources Kim Collier \$303,329</li> <li>10 Vice President Clean Energy Strategy Josh Jacobs \$270,500</li> <li>11 Vice President Operations Daniel Koch \$249,235</li> <li>12 Former SVP and Chief Financial Officer Daniel A. Doyle (Retired September 1, 2021) \$400,453</li> <li>13 Former SVP and Chief Operations Officer Booga K. Gilbertson (Retired October 1, 2021) \$365,633</li> <li>14 Director Controller and Principal Accounting Officer Stephen J. King \$229,421</li> <li>15 Director Corporate Treasurer Cara Peterman \$218,753</li> </ul> <p>According to a recent press release on the UTC website, a group of staff have come up with a proposed settlement with PSE that will increase rates to consumers closer to 6.5% for gas and 11.4% for electricity in 2023. No further details were provided. While this is an improvement over what PSE originally proposed, I would charge the Commission with negotiating harder! This is still a significant increase and burden to consumers.</p>
	<p>Barbara Braun</p>	<p>Web</p>	<p>In UE-220066 and UG-2200067 PSE is asking for a nearly 20% rate increase to line the pockets of its shareholders. I believe the projects they are using to justify the rate increase were not justified and are not needed to improve reliability. Tacoma LNG plant and Energize Eastside are examples of projects where they coerced and threatened city governments and ignored cries of the public in order to force the projects through.</p> <p>These projects also do nothing to put PSE on the path to CETA compliance.</p>



			<p>PSE customers already pay among the highest rates in the state for energy. How can they have the audacity to ask for more? They waste rate payers money by spending 100s of millions on advertising and greenwash to convince customers they are doing the right things. They claim to be improving reliability and do nothing about maintenance. They hire the best attorneys and spare no expense to fight for their unneeded projects. They contract work out to their cronies who charge maximum fees and spend lavishly on highly inefficient project implementation. Everyone is benefiting except to customers and residents of Washington.</p> <p>PSE cannot be allowed to keep charging us more and more to destroy our environment and increase our CO2 emissions, just to appease their shareholders.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my view.</p>
	Elaine Wood	Web	<p>The rate hikes are astronomical. The UTC is taking advantage of consumers. With inflation so high on all products, a recession, it is too much to ask for an increase. As a senior citizen, social security possible increases will not cover what you are proposing. Look at 1-3% instead of 12-15%.</p>
	Jeremiah Welsh	Web	<p>We the People of the United States are sick and tired of taxes continually being raised on us without a voice or a vote. There is no reason to keep raising taxes on the lower and middle class citizens of the United States. Raising Taxes does nothing but put a hardship on working class Americans like myself and others. I vote "No" on the current proposal that is currently pending. There is nowhere in the United States Constitution, were it states that we are obligated to pay any sort of tax whatsoever, so stop trying to create a tax hike for your own personal gain.</p>
	Alan Kawashima	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the incredibly high requested rate increases by Puget Sound Energy. I find their reasoning without merit and also ask why they have waited to apparently recoup their capital and operating investments.</p> <p>This puts an increasing burden on the retired, like me, who are on fixed incomes and depend solely on Social Security for their monthly and annual income.</p> <p>PSE's requested increases which total 19.62% (Electric) and 16.08% (Gas) over the course of three years is unreasonable.</p> <p>We are constantly being hammered about conserving energy, which I have done, but it seems the more we conserve, the more the utilities like PSE must find ways to increase their profitability. The more we cut back,</p>

			<p>the more we are penalized and charged.</p> <p>Please deny these requested rate increases.</p>
	Ilona Thompson	Web	<p>This customer is a senior citizen living on social security and does not have the means to afford a 16% rate increase for energy.</p>
	Neal Carlson	Web	<p>Reference Docket UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>Increases in electrical and gas service are unfair and unjustified. These are substantial increases for homeowners in Puget sound. Having retired this year Property taxes has been exponential. And that utility bills are going to make it just as difficult on the communities. Electricity should be a cheap commodity in Washington state and the gas is only a byproduct of refineries. These are significant increases and I'm not justified as a reasonable increase in rates that everyone has to pay.</p>
	Steve Buckholdt	Web	<p>I just received in the U.S. Mail a notice from Puget Sound Energy regarding a requested rate increase for electric service as well as natural gas. My comments are concerning the electric rate increases ( I do not have natural gas available in my area). The 15.8% rate increase requested for 2023 is a dramatic increase, especially as consumers are hit with already record rates of inflation for many other goods and services. What is especially troubling to me is that there is no quantification for why this high rate increase is necessary. There are only vague bullet points like "...to provide safe and reliable energy service." How exactly was it calculated that a 15.8% increase was necessary? There is nothing provided to justify this high increase. As a PSE residential customer of over 40 years, I strongly urge the UTC to deny this rate increase. Thank you.</p>
	Gloria	Web	<p>I'm writing regards to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. My husband and I strongly opposed to an overall 13.59% increase in rates for both Electricity and Natural Gas Service.</p> <p>We understand the importance of slow down the global warning. In order to meet the requirements of decarbonization by shutting down reliable source of energy (coal mines) and replace with unreliable source of energy (wind and solar) are simply unacceptable. At home, we already use energy efficient refrigerator, heater, water boiler, thermostat and light bulbs. We did our best to save energy. Yet our utility bills go up every year due to price hike.</p> <p>If you allow PSE to raise price of electricity and gas 13.59% in one year many middle-class residential customers can't afford the utility bills in 2023. They are not qualified for assistance either.</p> <p>PSE needs to figure out the long-term sustainable and economical energy solutions before shutting down coal mines or buying energy from out-of-state coal mines. It is irresponsible and unethical of PSE saying it is providing safe and reliable energy service while undermining the energy supply.</p> <p>Look closely to Dallas Texas. Following are excerpt from the Dallas Morning News on July 11,2022.</p> <p>Wind power — a key source of electricity in Texas — is being sidelined just when the Lone Star State needs it most, with turbines generating less than a 10th of what they're capable of producing.</p> <p>A scorching heat wave is pushing the Texas grid to the brink. Power demand is surging as people crank up</p>

			<p>air conditioners. But meanwhile, wind speeds have fallen to extremely low levels, and that means the state's fleet of turbines is at just 8% of their potential output.</p> <p>Texas may be America's oil and gas hub, but it's also long been the country's biggest wind-power state. The renewable energy source has become highly politicized: Some critics blamed frozen wind turbines for the Texas grid's failure during a deadly winter storm last year, even though disruptions at plants powered by natural gas were the bigger culprit.</p> <p>The current lows for Texas turbines also point to a broader contradiction facing the world as it transitions to cleaner energy sources. While countries across the globe are generating more electricity from intermittent wind and solar sources, large-scale, battery storage is still in its ascendancy. That leaves major grids more fragile and vulnerable to shock.</p> <p>Look at Australia right now. It is facing an energy crisis despite an abundance of natural gas and coal. Due to it wants to go green. It shut down many coal mines in the past decade and many old mines were not properly maintained. Now Australia is ill prepared with the shortage of energy supply and huge price spikes. Not everyone is able to afford the price hike to keep warm in the winter months.</p>
	Roger Martin	Web	<p>I spoke late in the hearing tonight. I really like the format. It needs a few tweaks, but it is very useful. When I spoke I had nothing prepared. However, I made an error in my commentary about what I hope you folks will review. The report done by UC-Berkeley and ASU was done in a different year than what I stated. I got some numbers transposed. Here is a link to the report about the problems about building on shoreline landfill. Pay particular attention to the animated graphic that shows the combined effects of sinking and sea level rising for San Francisco Intl Airport, and please read about how the landfill collapsed in the Loma Prieta Earthquake. Pay attention also to how the gas lines buried in the landfill broke when the earthquake hit. Who pays for any lawsuits that come out of damage or injuries from fire or explosion from the LNG facility? Answer: customers of PSE and residents of Tacoma. Look it up. PSE cannot be sued for building in an unsafe place and without adequate scientific research on its safety.</p> <p><a href="https://news.berkeley.edu/2018/03/07/sinking-land-will-exacerbate-flooding-from-sea-level-rise-in-bay-area/">https://news.berkeley.edu/2018/03/07/sinking-land-will-exacerbate-flooding-from-sea-level-rise-in-bay-area/</a></p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Roger T Martin</p>
	Samuel Fetchero	Web	<p>PSE's proposed rate increase of 13.59% in 2023 for Electric Service, and 12.98% for Natural Gas Service, is an abomination. It is way above inflation. PSE should work to keep their costs under control and rates should never be higher than inflation. And, we just entered a recession. People are struggling.</p> <p>Also, I object to PSE increasing their authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9% should not be approved. Now is not the time. They make plenty of money. If anything, it should be reduced. Washington State has</p>

			been for over 2 years and is STILL in a STATE OF EMERGENCY. PSE should not be allowed to price gouge Washington consumers.
	Fang Cui	Web	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are very angry about the PSE Energize Eastside Project since the project is totally UNNECESSARY. By using old technology it destroyed thousands trees, damaged many city views and views for many houses; It is also possible to hurt people in the future, especially the children, by the much stronger EMF (Electric and Magnetic Fields).</p> <p>But the project is not finished yet , PSE started to ask high electricity bill. How greedy PSE is !! From I understand that PSE will make money from the Energize Eastside Project ( I believe this since they pushed the project so hard.) Then why let us, the suffered people from the project, pay the project back ? IF the government let PSE get their wish again, ( Like Bellevue and Renton city government did for Energize Eastside Project ) I would like to ask if our government is PSE's government or people's government?</p> <p>And recession may start soon, does our government want to increase burden on the ordinary people in this time??!!</p> <p>Thanks.</p>
	Craig Keeton Sr.	Web	I'm against it because in the past year there were concerns financially about natural gas pricing going up. Instead it went down and we never got a price break when it went down. They also have a CEO that makes 3.34 million dollars a year, and in reading their explanations that officer's salaries are put into the billing. So we're paying for part of the executives salary in our bills. I have a business of my own and I can get price increases very rarely, but I am required to put price increases back in the business and Avista should be required to do so as well instead of billing us for their own equipment and executive compensation.
	Karla Ward	Web	I am opposed to PSE's proposed rate increase, for the reasons argued by the Office of the Attorney General of Washington.
	Ruth Holbrook	Web	A 13.59% residential rate increase for electricity is unconscionable and should not be approved for several reasons. 1. COVID-19 created impacts the effects of which on employment and peoples' ability to keep up with existing obligations- PRIOR to additional increases, still exist. 2. PSE's reason for the request as stated in their insert in my recent bill is utter BS: "to recover increased operating costs." Other entities absorb the cost of doing business or they go out of business when people refuse to continue doing business with them due to increased cost. People who have PSE as their residential service provider for electricity are not at liberty to simply shop elsewhere when costs are exhorbitant. Please deny this rate increase request.

	Julia Bonsignore	Web	<p>Comments typed verbatim by Sam Cooper after call from customer to Consumer Protection line - We are opposed to the increase because our incomes are not increasing at the rates that others are. My job I got a few dollars increase. Everything is going up, gas, milk and groceries. For my apartment we use electric for heat. Going into the cold season our bills for the month are about \$120 per month. We obviously don't want this. My partner has a fixed income. He's not getting a raise. Please don't do it. Find a way. Please don't do it! It's interesting that our property management company told us about it. It may be an issue for them also. Everybody uses energy and everyone's costs are going to go up in the cold and dark season where people are going to be using electricity. Those are my main points.</p>
	Valerie King	Web	<p>Docket UE-220066 for Electric Service          Docket UG-220067 for Natural Gas Service</p> <p>I am writing to strongly oppose PSE's request for rate increases. First, and I think most importantly, I don't see why consumers should be forking over extra dollars just so PSE can bump up its Return on Equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. I think if they are making 9.4% they are lucky and should be satisfied.</p> <p>Second, I don't know who are the "stakeholders" whose expectations PSE is trying to meet, but how does PSE know what customers expectations are? I never received a survey to ask me what my expectations are. I would like to know how many customers expect PSE to decarbonize its energy system.</p> <p>Third, I don't like the idea of the advanced metering infrastructure that enables robust, 2-way communication. I don't want my house to be communicating unnecessarily with PSE.</p> <p>Fourth, I'm opposed to the impracticality of electric vehicles and don't want to be paying for charging stations OR for educating (brainwashing) consumers into buying electric vehicles.</p> <p>Fifth, I do not want to see a doubling of the solar rooftops. Solar panels have a limited life span and are destructive to the environment when it comes to disposal.</p> <p>Sixth, I do not want the continued modernization and decarbonization of natural gas pipelines. I don't care about low carbon fuels and green hydrogen. And I certainly don't care about upgrades to customer-facing technology and online self-service tools.</p> <p>I DON'T WANT TO PAY FOR THINGS THAT I DO NOT SUPPORT. The rate increase is THEFT.</p>
	Christy F Frank	Web	<p>Please don't make the middle class suffer more financially to increase your profit margin.</p>
	Yujin Ghim	Web	<p>When everything is going up in price due to inflation, it is unconscionable from a already profitable company that makes 25% net profit to raise their prices. They want to raise our rates by 15%? The majority of people</p>

			are already struggling with bills in these hard times, and for a company that makes enough money wanting more should not charge what they want because they have a monopoly.
	Esther Poirier	Web	If approved, PSE rates for electric and natural gas services for residential customers would increase by approximately 28% in 2023 and over three years would increase by almost 36% according to the notice that I received. That is an exorbitant increase! Such a huge rate increase would have a detrimental effect on customers who are already facing housing challenges. If part of the reason for this increase is increased capital investments, then that investment cost should be lowered.
	Dave White	Web	With regards to Dockets UE-220066 (electric service) and UG-220067 (natural gas service), it was noted in the PDF that part of the proposal was to raise rates significantly to achieve a return on equity. Making everyone pay more for a utility that people cannot live without to achieve return on equity for investors and stakeholders seems disingenuous at best, and a necessary utility should not be operated as if it were a business on the New York Stock Exchange. Electricity should not be leveraged as a profit margin.
	Morrey & Penny Eskenazi	Web	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>We strongly object to the outrageous rate increase that PSE is seeking. PSE has sought and been granted yearly rate increases for over ten years but this huge increase simply cannot be justified. Their proposal would increase rates in the first year by a net of 12.9% for electricity starting in January 2023, with increases of between 1.2 and 2.7% in the second and third years.</p> <p>We seniors are significantly impacted. The cost of our residential power has escalated continuously and now that we are retired and we are home all day, we use more power, particularly for lights and air-conditioning. PSE takes a big hunk out of our budget. As seniors we depend on this utility for our well being. Because PSE is a monopoly we don't have other options, we either pay or suffer a substantial decrease in our quality of life.</p> <p>PSE continues to pursue infrastructure projects like Energize Eastside, the Lake Hills Transmission Line, and the Tacoma LNG plant. These projects raise safety risks for residents, destroy thousands of valuable urban trees, and do little to provide cleaner energy. PSE refuses to provide data demonstrating the need and safety of those projects. They seem unwilling to invest in smart technology and micro-grids to maintain power after disasters like earthquakes or malicious attacks, cleaner energy, preservation of trees, improved reliability and battery technology.</p> <p>Until PSE demonstrates a commitment to improve reliability, reduce environmental impacts, and actually listen to community concerns, we urge the Commission to deny all PSE rate increases.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Morrey & Penny Eskenazi
	Carol L Berglund	Web	How about something more reasonable. I am a 80 year old renter whose income is just over the eligibility for any assistance.
	Gloria hubacker	Web	hello, I do understand the need to cover rising costs, but please remember that it is hard times for many of us. My husband & I are retired on fixed incomes. We have very limited -as in practically no- means to cover increases. At the very least, please do not increase rates to also increase "return on equity"! thank you, Gloria Hubacker
	Xuan Hoa T Le	Web	The proposal is to increase 12.98% in 2023. It is way too much for each household in WA and even in the United States. The wage for an employee would have been increased from 2% to 5% in a year, so it is impossible for an energy company to increase way a lot in their rates. It will make residents poorer and more crisis to the residents.
	Kathleen Bergman	Web	PSE's proposed increase is excessive.
	James Savinski	Web	It is unconscionable to raise rates by double digits
	Brian Duffer	Web	I know inflation requires all businesses to consider price increases, but the percentage of the rate increases PSE is requesting both for electricity (UE-220066) and natural gas (UG-220067) are going to prove to be too great at once for most people; whether at their own residences or because it will drive up prices at virtually all businesses to compensate. Please reject this double-digit rate increase so that we, the rate payers, can afford to continue to live in this state.
	Jonathon Cheah	Web	The proposed rate table for the next 3 years is too high and unwarranted. While increases due to inflation is understandable, this proposal will hurt the citizenry more. The management of Puget Sound Energy should show how much is their profits affected with this increase. That would be a more accurate reflection of the underlying reasons for the rate increase. Also, they should show their proforma profit & loss for the same period as well, so that we have a better understanding of the need for the rate increase.
	David Unsworth	Web	With reference to Docket UE-220066 and the proposed price increases. Raising energy rates at this time would be detrimental and burdensome to households. The vast majority of people (myself included) have had to cut back on discretionary spending recently, in order to pay their bills on time and in full. It would be egregious of PSE to increase prices when their customers are already strapped for cash. Furthermore, energy consumers in Western Washington have no other choice asides from PSE for their electricity supplier. We already have to pay the high prices that PSE demand, let's not give them the go ahead to raise these rates at a time of such high inflation.

	Arden Haines	Web	The last thing we need is a rate hike. There was just a rate hike. It is too soon for another one. We are in a recession, right. There is a point at which the middle class will no longer be able to afford increases like this. My pay check is not going up 13% any time soon. Please do not approve PSE's proposed rate hike.
	Kevin Korte	Web	Dockets UE-220066 UG-220067 When inflation is at an all-time high, PSE proposes a rate hike that goes well above the average inflation rate. While it would be understandable if they would need it to cover higher operational costs and wages, this is not the case. They plan to increase their return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. As a monopoly, their return on equity is almost guaranteed. The average return for guaranteed investments is around 1%. Thus, this increase is nothing more than greed. Not only do they plan to pay out more money, but they also plan additional capital investments. Investments that would increase the value to the shareholders. All at a cost to primarily residential consumers, which are already squeezed by inflation and do not have a chance to switch energy providers to better-managed ones. Consequently, the commission should reject any increase above the average inflation rate.
	Julie Beffa	Web	I am completely against PSE's proposed 20% increase in residential electrical rates. It is unfathomable that a private company such as PSE can request an electrical rate increase for a project like Engergize Eastside that is not yet complete and still has unverified and unknown costs. Imagine the open-ended cash draw of asking for and spending \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of the project when it hasn't even been started in some areas, and not finished in others? Not to mention the destructive toll it is taking environmentally, removing hundreds and hundreds of mature trees and setting up metal polls much taller in height in the path. Years of providing citizen input and requests for justification of this project have fallen on deaf ears from the City of Bellevue (Hearing examiners particularly) and other eastside cities. It is truly a case of deep pockets by PSE and its shareholders able to ward off residents' requests for new data to justify the rate increases, need for more power lines and use of more modern technology. PLEASE do not grant this rate increase to further the ROI for PSE investors! Be the guardian of citizens of King County trying to protect our environment and healthy communities by using new electrical technology, and not rewarding this private, foreign owned corporation. Thank you. Julie Beffa
	Heng LIU	Web	Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 We object to the proposed rate hikes. We understand there are material and labor shortages and widespread cost increases in today's world but believe utility hikes can only fuel inflation. As a sole provider for utilities in this market, PSE should look to enhance their operation to be more efficient and utilize their leverage to cut down costs rather than riding the market inflation. It's challenging but PSE needs to focus on performance in a monopolized position to help relieve the pain on the working class. Thank you!
	Lisa Jones	Web	An average increase of 15.8% in one calendar year when the average income lags substantially behind that increase is asinine and unsustainable. You can't expect consumers to pay that much additional on a service



			that we have no ability to change. We cannot request quotes from other people, PSE being our service provider is dictated to us as a result it out your responsibility to make their increases sustainable for the average consumer...
	Sanford Ohren	Web	<p>While price increases are inevitable, the proposed rates are significantly out-of-line. PSE must be presuming continued highly inflated fossil fuel costs, but those "temporary" spikes seem to have peaked and are currently falling some.</p> <p>Instead of just granting blanket increases to fully recover those costs and maintain exorbitant profits, incentivise investments in sustainable and renewable energy sources by forcing them to economize, like everyone else.</p>
	Susanne Bradley	Web	I am a senior citizen on a fixed income. Even though a monthly increase of my gas and electric of 24.00 seems like a small amount to you, please keep in mind that PSE is not the only bill that has increased. My food, gas, and everything to live has increased by leaps and bounds. Please consider tightening your budget as I have tightened mine to make ends met. Thank you for your time in reading this.
	Patricia R. Clayton	Web	it is incredible that your company is asking for additional rate increases, after the enormous ones that were approved last year! Especially now...with the still ongoing pandemic, prices increases in EVERYTHING, that you want more! Shame on you for being so greedy! I don't know how you can justify these increases...
	Reena Rughani	Web	The hikes are way to high. Proposing 13-16% hike rates are too high. Seems like PSE claims they are working towards green energy and want us to flip the bills for that as well.
	Lorraine M.	Web	<p>The percentages of increase are flat out gouging, at a time when we all have near record inflation in everything else. Electric would go up 19.6% over the next three years &amp; Gas, 16.08%! I am trying to survive with only Social Security and my savings. This cannot be allowed to go through at these high percentages! Please stop this gouging by a foreign corporation from citizens in Washington before even more people become homeless, made so not only by the cost of housing but also by the utility bills they need to pay as residents.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Richard Conover	Web	I feel it is inappropriate to raise the rates 12.5 percent in the first year. PSE should have done a little better planning with inflation as it is now, it is unreasonable.
	Mary K Reed	Web	I lie in a Senior community in Kent Washington. Most of us are lower income and what even out families do not know, because we don't tell them, is we freeze in the winter because of the current cost of electricity for heating. There are no programs for us no additional helps. We go without what others consider basic needs just to have a little warmth in the colder months. I, myself, have 30.00 a month for groceries. That's it. In this economy its better for we seniors to die that try to continue. Mary K Reed

	Nathan Stix	Web	Why should rate payers begin rewarding PSE with a 9.8% rate of return on an infrastructure investment whose total cost is still unknown, whose need has not been verified and that would cost ratepayers close to \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of the project.
	Tammy Ansbro	Web	With everything literally going up food rent utilities, I understand an increase however the rates you are talking about will mean food or electric to some right now. I have four people in my house and I am the sole provider a 2 or 3% increase I can do, however a 15% is absolutely going to hurt my bottom line in being able to care for my senior mother and others in my home. Please rethink this and do not make the increase so high, We are supposed to be helping one another and rates like this are hurting the little guy just struggling to get by. Thank you, Tammy Ansbro
	Thomas Gilmore	Web	<p>My wife and I are retired and on a fixed income. Everything in our lives (food, medicine, gas, insurance, taxes, etc.) that we purchase has increased between 5% to 15% or more!</p> <p>Puget Sounds proposed rate increase is not justified. It was a mistake to ever allow an essential services company be purchased by foreign investors. Utility companies should locally owned non-profits that provide essential services to low income citizens. This proposed increase is simply more rete gouging by a monopoly!</p>
	wendy conway	Web	I cannot afford the proposed rate increase. Im sure Im not the only household who can't. The need stated by PSE does not align with the UTC mission to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utilities are fairly priced. PSE and its investors can find another way to feed their need for funds. Please dont allow the proposal, not even half of the percentage they are requesting should be placed on the backs of residential consumers.
	Rebecca Hewlett	Web	I do not support an increase in our power bills. This desire to run low and middle class out with all the green tax increases is out of control. At what point do we say we are pushing too hard and hurting people? This hurts with astronomical inflation. There is a balance to everything and this has tipped so far to the loud and forgot about those working hard to survive and hopefully live some. Please do not let this proposal go through, we cannot afford it in any way shape, form, or argument given to support this awful proposal.
	Katherine Chesick	Web	I oppose the proposed PSE electric and natural gas rate increases. Essentially, PSE is seeking to have homeowners pay for PSE's LNG facility. That facility was apparently built to supply LNG for the maritime industry and PSE now seeks to have homeowners pay for it by electric and natural gas rate increases. Shouldn't the maritime industry be paying for that facility? Further, I was against the construction of the LNG facility - we need to be building facilities that make energy from renewable sources (solar and wind, for example) not facilities that depend on fossil fuels. If the rate increases go through, I will be paying for something I am vehemently opposed to. Please, don't allow PSE's rate increase.

	Rodney Mace	Web	<p>I'm opposed to PGE's proposed price increases for 2023 of 16.34 and 12.14 percent respectively (electric and natural gas). During this period of rapid inflation an increase that exceeds the annual rate of inflation does nothing but exacerbates the rate payers shrinking pocketbook. I am supportive of an increase more in the 6.5-8 percent range. Possibly PGE could stage their multiyear capital improvement plan and increase rates in 2024 and 2025 more than currently proposed to recover their investments over a longer period.</p> <p>I'm also opposed to PGE increasing their return on equity by .5%. Why should their regulated return increase during a period when other equity returns are in negative territory for 2022?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.        R Mace</p>
	Steven Goegebuer	Web	<p>Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>The proposed January 2023 rate hikes are much too high and will be a burden to low income, elderly retirees and others.</p>
	Holly Taylor	Web	<p>re: Docket UE-220066</p> <p>I think PSE's proposal for a 13.59% rate increase for electricity is ridiculously high, and should be greatly reduced.</p>
	roger wilson	Web	<p>The proposal from the company (PSE): proposing a 17 percent increase over the next three years in its natural gas and electric service seems out of bounds. When the power is disrupted in my neighborhood (SE Olympia) sometimes days go by before any crew appear. I often wonder what effort could have been taken during good weather to help prevent service outage during the bad weather, but I see little activity on that side of the ledger. What I do note is the increased compensation by PSE executive staff to keep expense low and revenue flowing even when service is disrupted. Question: how will the additional dollars be expended for customer-not PSE-value?</p>
	Jeremy Wolf	Web	<p>The rate changes proposed by PSE are unacceptable and will have a negative impact on all communities. Increasing rates to increase private profits for PSE is crazy in the midst of government announcements to force the use of Electric cars. The commission should deny the proposal.</p>
	HAROLD AND DONNA MACOMBER	Web	<p>How are senior citizens supposed to be able to buy groceries? What with gas, food, etc. going up? Now we have to start turning down thermostats, etc. We try to keep our power bill as low as we can but we can't do much more. Please give senior citizens on SS, etc. a break!</p>
	Maureen Kane	Web	<p>I cannot afford a rate increase, we are affected by covid and other circumstances. We do not qualify for energy assistance, what will we do?</p>

	Seamus Mulcahy	Web	<p>In reference to Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 I am strongly opposed to PSE’s proposal. In an economic period where costs are rising exponentially and people are struggling to make ends meet, PSE is proposing to raise rates to “increase PSE’s authorized return on equity.” This is criminal. Reject the proposal. PSE failed to meet a full third of the UTC’s service-quality benchmarks, and yet they think they deserve more money. Reject the proposal. PSE is petitioning to have its penalty for failing to meet these benchmarks reduced. Reject the proposal. PSE is proposing residential customers bare a proportionally higher rate increase than business. Reject the proposal.</p>
	Rebecca Kinnestrand	Web	<p>PSE proposed rate increase is an affront to taxpayers. Permits have not even been obtained from all city's for the Energize Eastside project and they already want to raise our rates? I do not believe they have adequately shown the actual NEED for this project as they will not release a realistic summer load level. There are so many alarm bells that this project is a money grab by this company from Washington State taxpayers to fund an unwanted project so they can sell energy internationally. Please see through the smoke and mirrors here and deny this request.</p>
	Lucy	Web	<p>I am begging. Please no.</p>
	Daniel Evans	Web	<p>We are on a fixed income and the proposed rate increase is huge. The utility company seems to be getting greedy at our expense.</p>
	Flavio Ribeiro	Web	<p>This is regarding Puget Sound Energy GRC, Docket UE-220066 &amp; UG-220067.</p> <p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>I am a practicing electrical engineer, currently employed as Partner Research Manager at Microsoft. Previously in my career I developed control equipment for electricity generation, transmission and distribution. Most of my customers were utilities like PSE. I consider myself qualified to comment on this topic.</p> <p>I petition the commission to reject PSE's request to increase rates due to their insufficient effort transitioning to renewables. PSE's press releases are full of statements around green energy, but Energize Eastside indicates that in practice, in \$ amounts, PSE's investment plan still revolves around legacy infrastructure for fossil fuels.</p> <p>I will always support building state of the art infrastructure for decarbonization, understanding that it will be expensive. But I'm not seeing a priority effort from PSE to introduce new technology at scale. I believe this proposed rate increase is PSE's latest attempt at extracting money from fossil fuels, masked by increased use of greenwashing in press releases. I am opposed to the opportunity cost and to the massive externalities of building with obsolete technology.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the UTC to deny PSE's request for rate increase, and direct them towards engineering state</p>

			<p>of the art solutions for renewables, with a sense of urgency, at scale.</p> <p>Best regards,          Flavio Ribeiro, Ph.D.</p>
	Katherine Goebel	Web	<p>I am commenting on Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. The electric and natural gas rate increases proposed for 2023 are simply too high for most Washingtonians. As we try recover from the COVID pandemic and struggle with inflation and rising costs for everything, this large increase will only add more financial insecurity for many families, When I look at my bills over the past seven months, the rate increase will add approximately \$20.00 to my bill each month. I support Puget Sound Energy's efforts for reduce carbon emissions and to provide safe and reliable energy services, but a rate increase of this size doesn't make sense during this time of economic uncertainty.</p>
	Shelley Eckersley	Web	<p>I cannot even imagine with the inflation numbers these dates that Puget Sound Energy should be able to increase their rates. Years of Covid and now inflation numbers as they are, an increase is not justified</p>
	Jay Blish	Web	<p>I am opposed to the rate increase.</p>
	Ross Marquardt	Web	<p>I do not have the information or expertise to judge if the proposals for substantial rate increases for residential electricity and gas customers due to decarbonization costs, capital operating costs, and future capital investments is warranted. I can accept they are.</p> <p>However, I do NOT accept that an increase of guaranteed profit from 9.4% to 9.9% is warranted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consumer inflation was 9.1% in June 2022. It is insulting that my electric bill will also go up, just so investors can make more profit</li> <li>2. My credit union pays 0.15% on my savings there. 9.5% return on equity seems very high to me, and 9.9% is outrageous.</li> <li>3. The Standard and Poors 500 year to date return is -13.34%. A 9.5% guaranteed return is excellent in comparison</li> </ol> <p>Deny Puget Sound Energy's request to increase return on equity.</p>
	Paul W Routt	Web	<p>Re: Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067.</p> <p>I am against these increases b/c PSE is a big company and has lots of money to survive and thrive without them.</p> <p>This is especially true when, in 2020, top management's compensation ranged from \$845,600 - \$5,296,000. Two of these people made over \$5,000,000 and three of them made over \$1,000,000.00 in 2020. Members of the Board of Directors received outrageous compensation packages too (especially since they meet only four times a year). The compensation packages in 2020 ranged from \$87,000.00 - \$231,000.00. Six of these directors received amounts above and below \$200,000.00.</p> <p>If PSE can afford to pay these people this much money then it doesn't need higher utility rates.</p>

	John Otto	Web	(Comments received via phone call to consumer program line by Sam Cooper on 7/27/2022, 8:54 a.m.) I am a senior citizen on a fixed income. With all the current inflation, price increases, I cannot afford an electric price increase. Thank you for your consideration.
	Teri Hall	Web	Before rate increases like the one PSE is proposing are allowed I think we the public should be able to scrutinize the rate of profit this company already makes. Seniors, low income folks, others, cannot pay these prices for essential services that keep them safe and warm. How much profit does this company need to make? DO NOT allow this rate increase. Please.
	Vicki Littell	Web	We are an elderly couple on a fixed income. Utilities in Bonney Lake are very high already. Everyone has had setbacks with COVID and cost of living. I am no longer able to get a job to help defray the daily living costs. The increases that are requested by PSe for our electric and natural gas will impact our daily living significantly. As we are aging, our medical costs are increasing. Taxes are increasing. Fuel and food are increasing. Our "return on equity" or our savings has DECREASED by over 10% while PSE is trying to obtain an authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%. Why don't we require them to sell properties they own to offset this increase instead? Families are having problems meeting daily needs. I don't see a need to increase the return on equity for PSE while we residents are going backwards and losing on our equity.  Please DO NOT AUTHORIZE THIS REQUESTED CHANGES TO PSE RATES.
	Terrell Wayne Lee	Web	Concerning the proposed rate increase to electric and natural gas rates in excess of 12% please consider the mistakes made in the past by allowing these two utilities to merge. We all voiced concern that ending competition and allowing monopoly power would cause increased cost to the public, but our voices went unheard. Now rates continue to increase and out of state buyers reap the benefits Washington state citizens and tribes sacrificed to provide. Now due to government financial mistakes inflation runs rampant. As a senior citizen relying on social security payment which ARE NOT being raised to match this proposed 13% rise, we ask; How can you in good conscious approve this rate hike to Washington State citizens? The maximum rate increase you can allow should be tied to match the exact same rate increases the government gives to us senior citizens via social security adjustments. That does not mean simply providing difficult to apply for loopholes we are unable to navigate and apply for. Those only help a small percentage and are notoriously exclusive and difficult to receive. Please match any rate increase to the same Percentage increase the US Government adjusts our pensions.
	Diane Sue	Web	The proposed rate increase seems extreme. I hope you will consider that many customers are already under financial distress due to high inflation rates. Thank you.
	Wendy Langen	Web	The rate hike is too much without an increase in value.
	Tom Roper	Web	Looking over PSE's performance ratings listed in the rate increase proposal letter. PSE's performance ratings look good to me considering everything. My personal satisfaction with PSE's service is good.

			This is a horrible time to increase rates when the national inflation average is the worst it has been in 40 years. This is ridiculous what PSE is proposing at this time.
Linda Hudson	Web		Comments taken verbatim by Sam Cooper during call to Consumer Protection line - I got the notice in my bill about docket UG-220067, Natural Gas service, and no. They do not need to raise the rates anymore.
Kent Reister	Web		PSE already makes substantial profit and their request for a 15.8% rate increase is insulting when they are already failing to re-invest their earnings into infrastructure updates and maintenance at an appropriate level. They have the worst service up-time rate in the state. When they are already not doing their job, more profits will simply line their pockets instead of improving service for rate payers. Even with the massive inflation of late, PSE's fleecing of rate-payers for years deserves to be punished. Their rate increase request should be denied in full. There should be no rate increase at all. PSE should be made to realize that extracting profit and failing to give adequate service is grounds for them to be a money-losing industry instead of a money-gaining industry.
Suzette Crockett	Web		I am not in favor of a rate increase by Puget Sound Energy (Docket UE-220066). During this time of exceedingly high inflation, I'm low income and already wear several layers of clothes during the fall and winter (and spring!) to keep warm instead of having to increase my heat from 64 to 69 degrees fearing I may not pay my bill. My elderly mother is far worse of than me and when it's cold outside rarely moves around the house, which is so important for her to do!!! Regulatory agencies should reign in excess corporate profits by monopolies like PSE
Nancy Mertz	Web		I am in a 55 and older community in Bellingham. The increase is a lot to absorb for fixed income people.
Faye Landskov	Web		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PSE, like all other utilities, received large amounts of COVID relief from the government to make up for losses during the 'forgiveness' period. I have already paid, through this relief for PSE to be made whole. I do not wish to be doubly taxed for the same benefit in order to pay stakeholders a large return on investment.</li> <li>2. PSE should not be able to GUARANTEE a return to investors AT ALL. For PSE to take money from consumers like me who are on a fixed income and can get a fraction of a percent on my savings to GUARANTEE their investors a nearly 10% return is both outrageous in this economy and I think unsupportable. This is a bad practice and it hurts low income consumers of which there are a large number to benefit the few investors.</li> </ol>
Greg Freeland	Web		<p>A utility company has NO NEED to increase their profits. A utility company should not HAVE profits.</p> <p>Further, the proposed increase has no supporting evidence of rising costs for maintenance or upgrades. Further, PSE has shown zero evidence of any intent to upgrade the infrastructure.</p> <p>This is a cash grab by greedy politicians in the middle of an pandemic and economic crisis.</p> <p>Start building more affordable housing and stop robbing us.</p>

	Michael	Web	<p>This concerns PSE's proposed change in rates.</p> <p>The statement provided by PSE lists several reasons for the rate adjustment but none of those include increase in maintenance and upkeep budget nor increase pay for their employees. With the increase in climate change related issues associated with power utilities it is concerning that PSE's rate increase doesn't show any aspect of resiliency for future disasters nor funding to take care of current facilities. I am worried this rate increase will be a salve in a few areas while being more about padding the bottom line and pockets of the C-suite.</p>
	Natalie Duryea	Web	<p>It is outrageous for PSE to create an antiquated powerline system that criss crosses bellevue, further ruining the sight lines of our city. Furthermore - to start the project, while the project is still in question and increase rates by 10-20% is a bait and switch to the users. PSE's power grid doesn't benefit bellevue, and bellevue energy users shouldn't bare the burden. Please do not approve this rate increase and ask PSE to act responsibly for their charter.</p>
	Sean	Web	<p>Their proposed rate hikes are insane.</p> <p>We need more than one service provider to choose from. They are using their monopoly to illegally raise rates far above what they are worth. Either the state should pass a law to limit annual utility increases, PSE should be bought out by the state and run as a public utility, or we need more providers to choose from.</p>
	Leslie Geller	Web	<p>PSE does NOT deserve a rate increase for Energize Eastside!!! PSE shouldn't even be undertaking Energize Eastside!!! PSE has real gall to request a 20% increase in rates. My neighborhood has lousy electricity reliability, and Energize Eastside will not improve reliability.</p> <p>I subscribe to updates from CENSE. In their update asking us to comment to the UTC, they included the following, which I was incredulous to read.</p> <p>"Why should you be outraged? For the first time, PSE is asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) to allow an electrical rate increase for a project that is incomplete. Yes, PSE is erecting Energize Eastside poles in Renton and South Bellevue, but construction in Newcastle has not begun, and hearings for the North Bellevue permit have not been announced. Why should rate payers begin rewarding PSE with a 9.8% rate of return on an infrastructure investment whose total cost is still unknown, whose need has not been verified and that would cost ratepayers close to \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of the project."</p> <p>PSE doesn't deserve a rate increase. Please oppose this application.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Heidi Brantzeg	Web	<p>PSE rates keep going up and up, I don't believe the fees are for increased cost of electricity but rather higher profits for stake holders and increased waged for PSE leadership. Surveys have shown that actual electricity</p>



			usage in the Puget Sound area has gone down due mainly to more efficiently build homes and buildings and the increased use of energy efficient appliances. PSE has a monopoly in PS, it is unfair that we can not get ahead. I keep my house set at 62 in the winter, yes, IT'S COLD and we have to wear sweaters and sometimes hats inside, but the power bills keep going up. 20% increase criminal, especially for those of us on fixed incomes. PSE needs to be focusing on serving their customers over their share holders.
	Adrian Barrera	Web	Unbelievably moronic and they need to be dissolved
	Marilyn Walker	Web	The utility, PSE, is requesting double digit increase next year well above inflation with a goal to increase return on equity. Most customers are also experiencing double digit property tax increases (mine went up 60%), gas prices that are through the roof and food inflation that we have not seen in decades if ever. They need to postpone or spread the increases out better. Families have not recovered yet and are dealing with massive increases that they have no control over. There is not even away to bring attention to the property taxes taxing us out of our homes. As a single parent I still make too much for assistance but have little to nothing left each month after the other bills. Please hold off on the large increases or spread them out over more years like the rest of us are having to do as we put off anything we do not have to have to survive, keep our jobs and feed our children.
	Faye Landskov	Web	Dear members of the UTC: It is my hope that the UTC understands a need for consumers to be protected from aggressive price hiking for profit rather than for sustainability and service. I wish to strongly object to the escalations in PSE rates in order "to increase PSE's authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9% in an economic climate when interest rates on savings are less than 1%. I would like the UTC to carefully examine where PSE intends to utilize the 2023 15.80% increase to customers to determine if it is NECESSARY or just to raise profits for investors and take money from users who are already struggling in this inflation heavy economy. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Faye Landskov
	Longtime public member	Web	The final listed reason for PSE rate increase is "increase ... authorized return on equity from 9.4% to 9.9%" This is AFTER the public is already paying for all the other costs/reasons listed above. With the public/Users paying for all the costs PSE incurs, there is NO reason to increase its equity. Any increase due to wages and inflation is covered under "to recover increased operating costs." 9.4% is adequate return for stockholders and management salary/bonuses. AND, increased rates are like a progressive tax .. it's low-moderate income classes that suffer more.

	David Peterson	Web	<p>Hello UTC</p> <p>PSE provided Residential customers notice of a 3-yr rate hike for Electric &amp; Natural Gas services starting January 1, 2023</p> <p>Electric: 13.59% (2023) 2.62% (2024) 1.20% (2025)</p> <p>Natural Gas: 12.15% (2023) 2.19% (2024) 1.74% (2025)</p> <p>This comes on the heels of the Inflation Reduction Act just signed into law. This law makes the claim that it will save households \$170 to \$220 annually and will reduce electricity volatility. Rate payers will be insulated from volatility in natural gas prices with electricity rates projected to decrease eve under a high natural gas scenario.</p> <p>The proposed 2023 rate hike is unacceptable when you look at the following 2 years under 3%. All 3 years should be under 3%.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your support of Washington State Residential energy consumers</p> <p>David Peterson</p>
	Dan Bakke	Web	The proposed rate increase is excessive and should be less than the current rate of inflation
	JANET KUSAKABE	Web	I oppose PSE proposed 20% increase (over 3 years) in residential electricity rates to cover Energize Eastside and other projects. As rate payers we should not begin rewarding PSE with a 9.8% rate of return on an infrastructure investment whose total cost is still unknown, whose need has not been verified and that would cost ratepayers close to \$2 Billion in increased rates over the life of the project.
	Corey Aldrich	Web	A company that is already getting over a 9% return on their investment doesn't need to increase consumer costs another 15% even if they need to pay some capital to switch to renewable electricity
	Susan Sullivan	Web	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>I recently received a notification from PSE that they are requesting a rate hike for residential customers of 19.62% in a period of 3 years. That seems excessive to me. I understand that costs are rising and infrastructure needs repair and updating. Will existing residential customers benefits increase commensurate with such a large rate increase? Please examine this request closely to ensure that residential customers aren't unfairly burdened with a rate hike. Thanks!</p> <p>Regards,      Susan Sullivan</p>
	Joann Schafer	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>I don't understand why it has to be such a large amount the first year. They want to increase it, the first year they want to increase it 12.98% the first year. Then 2024, they wanna increase much less. It seems its excessive to me. It shouldn't have to be that much all at once. I think we're in a stage where we're probably going to go into a recession and there's already a lot of people that are struggling.</p>

Bonnie Lee Karb	Web	Again Puget Sound energy is raising rates! Every thing is so expensive especially for us seniors. This needs to not happen!
Sue Brown	Web	We cannot afford a 20% increase for every utility, groceries, property tax, etc. We are just simply tapped out. Please say no to PSE's request. If an increase is approved it should be in line with the raise I received—3%. Thank you for looking out for consumers!
Joan Savard	Web	No to PSE Rate Hikes!!
DJI Roberts	Web	I have heard, and used, the term #PriceGouging, to describe substantial price hikes that abound as the US economy takes its turn towards equality as a result of the humanizing impact of an epidemic. If the UTC decides that PSE costs have gone up so substantially, so be it; but we as consumers must do what we can to allow the economy to adjust in some few ways; such that the least well off may enjoy those few improvements in our quality of life as we can negotiate; without all of the costs around us rising, sometimes even higher than what few wage gains some achieve.
kainui rapaport	Web	I oppose the proposed rate increase, Docket UE-220066
ROD MCLACHLAN	Web	THE PROPOSED 13.59% ELECTRIC SERVICE COMBINED WITH THE 12.98% NATURAL GAS INCREASES ARE EXTRAORDINARILY EXORBITANT AND IN MY OPINION OUT OF THE QUESTION. CLAIMING WE MUST "DECARBONIZE" IS RIDICULOUS AND NOT JUSTIFIED BY A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. SEEMS THAT MOSTLY ONLY THOSE SCIENTISTS FUNDED BY AND ENCOURAGED TO ESPOUSE CLIMATE CHANGE PROPAGANDA BY THOSE STANDING TO EITHER PROFIT POLITICALLY OR MONETARILY (OR BOTH) SUPPORT SUCH NONSENSE.
Brittany Dayley	Web	How can PSE possibly sort an increase of 12-16%?!?! With property taxes going insane, inflation, gas prices, everything! I'm a responsible, full time professional adult with a decent income and I literally cannot afford an increase like this. We already had to cut meat out of our meals due to budget constraints. Do you want MORE homeless in Olympia?!?!
Alannah	Web	Electrical prices are already way too expensive for the average family to pay for. The prices should go down. Find cheaper alternative sources of energy.
Kalla Susort	Web	The proposed electricity service increase of 13.59% over 3 years is EXCESSIVE. I worked 26 years for a corporation and was in the labor unions and NEVER did we ever get a cost of living increase over a 3 year contract over 2-3%. The corporation told the employees that it was a GENEROUS offer. I am now living on Social Security - Social Security does not allow a cost of living increase to get even close to that figure. Please do not even consider this ridiculous rate increase.
Jana M Foor	Web	It seems a very inopportune time for this steep rate hike given the effects of inflation, crime, and homelessness in our community at this time!

			This should be a RESOUNDING NO!
	Christy Bear	Web	It's outrageous that PSE would attempt/expect to increase our energy rates to fund a project that is not yet completed and that will not in anyway benefit our region -- studies show we do not need "Energize Eastside"! Plain and simple, it's corporate greed peddling mis-information in a scheme where PSE continues to rake in ridiculous profits on the backs of the people and communities they serve. ENOUGH! We don't want/need their project blight, and we sure as heck don't want to be finagled into paying them to mislead us down a rosy path that only enriches PSE coiffures and their C-suite execs.
	Abhinav Sharma	Web	This will amplify inflationary pressures coming from gasoline, groceries, and rental hikes.
	Dale L. Weir	Web	Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 No rate increase! This is not for the benefit of the customers who are already suffering from inflation, but rather a boost to Puget Sound Energy profits. Puget Sound Energy needs to be doing maintenance on their existing lines to prevent outages this winter from trees that have overgrown the power lines.
	Mark Adams	Web	One of the reasons PSE states is the reason for requesting a rate increase is to increase their return on equity from 9.4 to 9.9 %. My guess is that this is accounting double-talk for making more profit so that PSE can reward their investors and increase top management pay. Given today's economic conditions and the already wide economic gap between the wealthy and the rest of us, I can see no justification for handing more money to the wealthy at the expense of everyone else.
	Ramona Jack	Web	Due to being on Social Security I cannot afford a 13.9 percent increase in electric rates. I cannot afford the current rate now and Social Security will not raise my Social Security by 13.9 percent. I already have to visit the food bank as is to maintain. If it keeps increasing I will have to start using kerosene lamps, I will not have a choice!
	Isaiah Bier	Web	PSE's concern is only to increase their profits. A good example is the "Energize East side" which is based on fraudulent data which they do not want to disclose. Their service is much worse than the one we had before they took over Puget Power. Many more power outages. The rate increase they request is absurd and has no justification, except for their desire to increase profits and not quality of service. It is time that the UTC recognizes what this company is all about and prevent them from exploiting the public. Thanks for your attention, Isaiah Bier
	Colin Fox	Web	A proposed 13.59% increase in rates for electric (15.8% for residential customers) 12.98% (12.15% residential) for natural gas service for 2023 is outrageous, we are in a time of great uncertainty right now with the beginning of a recession - property market is slowing down dramatically, huge cost of living increases for residents with food - fuel etc. Property tax increases in King county. We are still in a pandemic

			<p>with covid-19 being widespread, war in the Ukraine.</p> <p>As a residential consumer this amount of an increase is not justified, and would greatly cause pain and suffering to us. PSE needs to focus on controlling how they spend money (how much do the executives get paid ?) and learn to balance their own finances with the vast amount that they currently collect - without taking the easy path and pushing more cost increases on its customers.</p>
	Dennis Ivanov	Web	<p>I completely disagree with this rate increase, as it will drive all the "productive" population out of the State. If that is the goal you are pursuing - you will achieve the impact you are seeking.</p> <p>Look at top 10 States that have highest electricity rates - they are experiencing "dumpster" syndrome and one of the highest outflow of tax-paying base.</p> <p>Now that the Counties are increasing property taxes - this action to increase energy rates - will propel the outflow and a possibility of referendum to replace our Commissioners including UTS representatives.</p> <p>Think twice - cut once. Not the other way around...</p>
	Jami Y Heinricher	Web	<p>PSE's proposal to raise gas/electric rates by 12-13% is outrageous, considering their current profitability. A desire to increase their profit margin over the needs of residential customers who are getting hit HARD with across-the-board inflation (much of it to prop up corporate profits) is unconscionable.</p>
	Shirley Mattioda	Web	<p>I am writing to voice my concerns over the proposed rate increase starting in January 2023. I am a senior citizen, my husband and I live together at our residence of over 55 years. We are on a fixed income. Our energy bill already increased almost \$75 recently. To raise our rates even higher will create an extremely difficult expense for us given the increase in the cost of living through food prices, gas prices, etc. I don't believe your request is fair, just or reasonable. I hope you will listen to the voices of all Senior citizens in your service area.</p>
	ROBERTA VOLLENDO RFF	Web	<p>Attorney General Bob Ferguson's office has determined that PSE included higher profit margins in their proposals than were justified. PSE is asking to increase their profit (ROE) to nearly 10% . That is crazy high!</p> <p>The AGO's also determined that PSE overestimated many costs to provide power to customers. The estimate was it was approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates. One of the ways they do this is through deferred maintenance of their poles and equipment as I have been the victim of such shoddy pole maintenance, personally. When the utility pole finally came down on the garage of my rental house, the date stamped into the pole was 1950, the year before I was born. I had to pay out of pocket for all the expenses related to the damage that was done on my lovely rental house and on my own home because the weight of the power lines ripped of the meters and solar hookups to my house as well.....then I had to wait over 8 months to be reimbursed by PSE for all the expenses and inconvenience their shoddy maintenance had caused me and my tenants. Please deny this rate increase and make them live within their current profit margin. Just a little example of how they pass their actual costs onto the consumer!</p>

			In times of high inflation it is incumbent on government agencies to reign in profiteering by corporations!
LEONIDAS RIGAS	Web		<p>When a company that regularly raises prices 1-3% per year, needs to raise prices 12+% in a year, it seems like bad planning to me. None of their projects and needs and future goals popped up in a night.</p> <p>Proposed Increases:          2023 12.9% for electricity and 11.9% for natural gas,          2024 2.7% more          2025 1.2% more</p>
Andrew Allen	Web		The 20% PSE rate hike is way too much. I'm comfortable with 10% over 3 years.
Sarah S. Nelson	Web		At a time when the nation is experiencing unprecedented inflation and we have one of the highest gas tax rates in the nation, you are going to jack up our rates by over 13% to comply with our governor's insane vision of being the leading eco warrior on the planet? I'd like to afford to continue to live on this planet and provide for the two children I'm raising on this planet. The statement that it is to comply with the wishes of customers and stakeholders is BS. Your customers would like to be able to heat and cool their homes year round.
joseph tarantino	Web		<p>Re: UG220067 rate increases</p> <p>Several issues with the proposed increases -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A 13 - 15% increase is very significant when there are already other large contributors to inflation. It is not clear what expense increase warrants this level of rate increase.</li> <li>2) I don't understand why there is need to recover 4 years of capital expense increase when the rate increase covers a 3 year period.</li> <li>3) There is no justification in the material I received why the return on equity needs to increase. Why can't it remain at 9.4%?</li> </ol>
Tom	Web		I vehemently oppose PSE proposal to increase rates. The notice states the increase is too "generate additional revenue". PSE need to control their costs first. Hitting customers with a rate increase to generate PSE revenue is utterly unacceptable.
Marieke Rack	Web		<p>Comment in reference to UE-220066 and UG-220067</p> <p>In 2023, PSE is proposing 13.59% and 12.98% increases for electric and gas respectively. This increase is huge and will contribute to the region's huge affordability crisis. All utilities need to, when they propose rate increases, indicate how they are minimizing their role in this crisis. Are they increasing customer assistance? Why did they operate beyond their means and now need to "recover" costs in 2023? Do they have a long term (30-50 year) plan for a sustainable rate path?</p>

			To be clear, I support PSE's efforts to be carbon neutral (should be now, not in 2030) and think that utility capital investments are critical to long-term regional health. Unfortunately, the rates proposed in 2023 are excessively burdensome to low-income customers and appear to reflect an insensitivity to their leadership role in our region's affordability. I request that the UTC require them to flatten their rate path.
	Heng LIU	Web	Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067 We object to the proposed rate hikes. We understand there are material and labor shortages and widespread cost increases in today's world but believe utility hikes can only fuel inflation. As a sole provider for utilities in this market, PSE should look to enhance their operation to be more efficient and utilize their leverage to cut down costs rather than riding the market inflation. It's challenging but PSE needs to focus on performance in a monopolized position to help relieve the pain on the working class. Thank you!
	Reed Fry	Web	This is far too much of an increase. According to the company's latest 10Q they are ALREADY making a 25% profit. They do not need a 15% raise that would severely harm their customers on a fixed income. If they are struggling to make the necessary funds to meet the target required by Washington Clean Energy Transformation Act, then perhaps electricity and gas needs to be a Public Utility District and not privately owned by a foreign entity so that when tax dollars are collected, it is solely to benefit the community and not boost the books for a private company.
	Liisa Wale	Web	I am very opposed to PSE Rate Hike proposal here in Washington State. I feel that they want to raise rates to PSE customers in part due to needing to pay for the LNG terminal in Tacoma. This LNG terminal should never have been built and is opposed by many who live within the area where the LNG terminal is. I am not ok with have to pay for that. I also am opposed to this hike due to the fact that PSE here in Bellingham has not been increasing their use of renewables in the "pie" and instead is relying too much on coal. PSE has also been actively working against local government who is working toward climate goals.  Thank you for listening.
	Joel Harris	Web	Their proposed increase in Electric and Natural Gas service seems extremely high given our current economic environment in Washington state. As we slowly come out of the recent pandemic, we have continued to see housing, fuel and other costs rise as the threat of recession looms. According to PSE's own communications to customers, residential customers would see an overall average increase in electric rates of 15.8% starting January 1st, 2023. Compounded by current inflation rates, which may yet increase, this results in an effective increase of over 17% and will hurt working families. Their reasons include an increase in their equity rates from 9.4% to 9.9%, which I think is a blatant (yet thankfully transparent) overreach when there is no increased value to the consumers. I am strongly against the rate increases that have been proposed by PSE and hope that the UTC will consider other options and only approve what is sustainable by the average consumer. I understand that decarbonization and infrastructure investments are necessary, but I would hope that this can be accomplished by no more than a single-digit (<10%) increase in their rates. Washington households have no vanguard against the rate of inevitable rising utility costs other than regulatory bodies like yourselves and we rely upon your prudence in these matters. Thank you.

	Stephan Weyte	Web	<p>Everyone knows WA has the most REGRESSIVE tax system of all the states. Low income seniors, like myself, pay more of their disposable income on fees, etc. Because this state has no income tax, which is the fairest way to tax citizens, WA nickels and dimes folks constantly because the State doesn't have a steady stream of income. Constant increases in gas, shopping, license, utility fees state taxes and more. When is someone going to have the guts to explain that the average resident of WA would be better off w/an income tax in lieu of state an other fees and taxes? Are Oregon's senior and low/median income citizens screaming about their tax situation? I haven't heard. Again, MOST REGRESSIVE TAXES IN THE NATION!</p>
	Sue Stronk	Web	<p>PSE should be put to shame about their Power and Gas rate increase they are asking the UTC for--Seattle City Light is asking about 1/3 increase than what PSE is asking--DO NOT FEED PROFIT \$\$\$ TO THEIR INVESTORS!!</p> <p>What we need here is public utility looking out for our interests--not PSE stockholders!! Energize Eastside was an unnecessary money grab by PSE--and everyone turned the other way about this project because PSE is allowed to buy influence in cities by sponsoring events ---PSE is everywhere buying influence anyplace they can--our city councils, Chamber of Commerce, Planning Commissions etc.--it needs to stop!! PSE should be made to go to EFSEC for every project approval they are asking instead of wasting city money and time if vetting their projects when they have no education to energy. --Get some Teeth UTC--and do a better job for the citizens!! Change your WAC rules now!!</p>
	Kristin Rudy	Web	<p>PSE should not increase rates by 2% the economy is not strong enough to handle it. Many families are barely hanging on. Power is essential and shouldn't be only for the wealthy. I get the need to increase rates, but that is too steep.</p>
	Katherine Wise	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>I'm not in favor, so... Washington residents, I don't know that we really have an opportunity to vote on these price changes or the green energy. It's been a slow creep over the years and I think some people have tried to voice opinion or speak to their representatives with what they would like to see. But now, government has decided this is the direction they want to take us in, with or without our approval, and it is going to be a substantial cost increase when I look at the pricing to Washingtonians. It really is just forcing us to take it or leave it. You either have electricity, natural gas, rebuild your house, spend extra money to refit your home for requirements that our utility companies are forced to comply with within a few years. There's no way to say we don't agree with this without just trying our best, calling and giving comments; I'm not going to go out and protest and I'm not sure it would do any good. It is going to be harmful. In looking at my bill over the last couple years, I've done my best to keep my utility cost down and natural gas is very clean and we know this. I feel, as a customer, I have tried to help out and it really does no good. Rates continue to go up, plans move forward because the government says "this is what we're gonna do and you have to do it." I don't agree with the rate changes and I strongly oppose them and hope the commission would consider some better alternatives.</p>
	Robert Hassted	Web	<p>Taken by CTC</p> <p>An overall increase in 2023, of 15.8 percent, seems too high. The average residential customer is hurting</p>



			<p>from record-high inflation, the pandemic, shortages, etc. And, as part of the rationale for the increases, PSE is increasing its profit to 9.9 percent. So, I also contribute a little each time for the green energy, but am disgusted with how little PSE has done to decrease its use of fossil fuel. Eastern Washington is a prime spot to increase wind energy, and to make large solar arrays, etc. So, just in general; the rate increase seems too high when we are hurting and I am not happy with PSE's reliance on fossil fuel.</p>
	Chris Breske	Web	<p>PSE's proposed rate increase for the Energize Eastside project is completely unjustified and should not be approved.</p> <p>Historically, electrical rate increases have not been imposed for unfinished projects. This has been the prudent approach that considers the interest of electric customers and not intrests of the electric company as would be the case if PSE' request is approved.</p> <p>Unfortunately, funds from this rate increase would only help to fund PSE's "Energize Eastside" project. This is a project that PSE has NEVER proven to be necessary or beneficial for local electric customers.</p> <p>Even if we assume that local customers would benefit from Energize Eastside, the current project status does not justify increasing the rates at this point for some very clear and obvious reasons: (A) Much of the work on this project has not even been started. (B) PSE has not received full approval to complete this project.</p> <p>Before any rate increases could responsibly be approved, PSE should provide adequate responses to the following WITH DATA to back them up:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Why should PSE customers be required to pay more money for no benefit? PSE has never provided sufficient FACT CHECKED data to back this up and refute the objections that have been provided.</li> <li>2) Even if PSE could show that local customers would benefit from Energize Eastside, why would PSE be allowed to increase rates for a service that doesn't even exist? Approving this request would be inconsistent with the precedent that has been respected for decades.</li> <li>3) Why should PSE customers pay for a project that has not even been fully approved to be completed?</li> </ol> <p>PSE customers should not be required to pay increased rates for a project that provides them with no benefit.</p>
<b>Undecided</b>			
	Francie Rutherford	Email	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility. Our state is quickly moving away from reliance on fracked gas, and it is wrong for PSE to be rewarded for continuing to promote reliance on fossil fuels in a time of climate crisis.</p>

			<p>As a person of faith, I believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy's service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right. This is wrong, I strongly object to this rate increase.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE's shareholders. Forcing customers to pay for the Tacoma LNG facility is especially unjust, as the vast majority of the gas will not go to heat their homes.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that the Puyallup Tribe and environmental organizations are still appealing Tacoma LNG's clean air permit in court. The Tacoma LNG project remains wildly unpopular, as the Tribe and local community continue to oppose its construction on the grounds of treaty violations, safety and health risks, and climate warming emissions associated with the continued use of fossil fuels. We are called to listen to those most affected by the facility.</p> <p>Please heavily curtail PSE's proposed rate increases. It is not in the best interest of Washingtonians to allow Puget Sound Energy to increase their profits and recover costs from construction of unjust fossil fuel facilities like Tacoma LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Francie Rutherford</p>
	Jennifer Stachowiak	Web	<p>I understand there are times that rates changes are needed, especially with Washington state wanting to get rid of all Fossil Fuel, but I'm curious what PSE is doing to help conserve more electricity, which would help with the demand, by encouraging the public to not use as much?</p> <p>I've tried to call and talk to someone about what was in place and the person I talked to didn't know and they said it is not PSE's job to do this, that you can't control what people do. That might be true, but you can influence it. I asked for a call back from someone to discuss and never got a call back.</p> <p>I see advertisements that PSE sends out to purchase backyard lighting. What about sending out information about using motion sensors so that backyard lighting they just purchased isn't on all night long? And do we really need more backyard lighting? Not only does it use up energy that isn't needed, but it creates light pollution, I can't even see the stars anymore in Renton. I feel strongly that PSE should be communicating regularly ways for folks to conserve, by turning off back door porch lights, string lights, flood lights, pond lights, putting front porch lights on motion sensors. Cities should be putting in motion street lights that aren't on all night long for no reason.</p> <p>The 2023 electric service increase of 15.80% seems like a lot. Same with the gas increase of 12.15% I</p>

			<p>wonder if the increases can be spread out more over the 3 year period? I'm sure you have looked at this and this is what you need to do. Thanks for listening and good luck</p>
Emily Watson	Web	RE: UG-220067 I understand that the company needs to increase prices to keep up with the expenses. What I'm concerned about is the 12.98% jump for the first year then it drops to less than 3% the following years (a total of 17.09%). I would rather see three consecutive jumps of approximately 6% to allow for personal budgets to adjust without having to take a huge hit at once. I would also like to see the increases occur during the spring so there is time to adjust to the increase instead of getting hit smack in the dead of winter (when bills tend to be the most expense).	
William E Burk	Web	To: Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission  Regarding PSE electric rate discount for the poor.  To The Honorable Commissioners,  Electric Rates are crushing the poor in the context of record breaking inflation.  Propose, if electric payer has EBT card to automatically give an indefinite 15% electric rate cut, so long as they have an active Food Stamp account.  Seniors, Disabled, and Poor typically keep their homes a chilling 60 degrees to make their fixed incomes meet their needs.  It is life threatening to deny heat to the poor.  Pets kept in the house last about fifteen years, but in the cold outside, they usually die before they are ten years old. Similarly humans have much shorter lives if left outside in the cold.  Please stop the killing the poor, disabled, and feeble with the chilling outside temperatures.  The PSE customer merely has to upload a picture of their EBT card or perhaps visit the PSE office where they pay their bills. It could be very simple to do.  Thank you for your consideration to help the poor and needy.	

			God and Jesus Bless you.
	Patrice Weidner	Web	I would like to see more power sourced from environmentally friendly sources such as Bonneville or any water generated electricity.  Thank you
	Jon Oesting	Web	I dont mind paying the avg \$12 more in rates BUT can I be assured that ALL the money goes to renewable projects, not profits and dividends?
	David Carpenter	Web	I'd like to know more about why the company has filed for such seemingly large increases? Comparing power rates here in Puget Sound to those in Chelan County, we're really paying a premium already. Would like to know more about the reasons behind the proposal.
	Robert L Barton	Web	During a power outage apparently caused by an auto accident on February 8th beginning at about 1:30 pm till about 3:25 am, I felt the length of the outage was extreme. The Utility's estimated time of the outage was not even close to the actual time. I'm sure PSE has experienced outages like this often. We need this information sent to businesses that serve senior living so they can make necessary arrangements for the residents safety. PSE needs to greatly improve their communications with the public!!!! Thank you
Yes			
	Keith H. Watts	Email	To whom it may concern,  Regarding the Puget Sound Energy rate increase request Docket UE-220066 & UG-220067  Please Approve the request.  Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfortunately natural gas whole sale prices have increased from \$2.50 to \$9.00 per Million BTU in one year due to the Russian invasion of Ukraine and other factors beyond PSE control.</li> <li>• The UK and western European countries have seen their electricity and heating costs rise 200 percent in one year. The PSE rate increase is small in comparison.</li> <li>• Russia shut off supply to Europe causing a huge increase in demand for liquid natural gas from the U.S.</li> <li>• Utilities across America are rising their electricity and natural gas rates due to whole sale energy price inflation.</li> <li>• Avista and other PUD in Washington State are requesting rate increases as well.</li> </ul> It is absurd to attribute PSE raising its rates to cover the cost of Energize Eastside projects.

			<p>Lets hope that whole prices return to normal soon and that utilities can reduce their rates in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely, Keith H. Watts</p>
	Mark Bruce	Web	<p>Utilities are expected to provide reliable energy to the community. They cannot do so without adequate funding. June 2022 CPI for Seattle was 10.1%. It is logical that rates should go up. The fact that rates are artificially low because rates were not adjusted during the pandemic. This supports higher rates to catch-up. I want reliable gas and electricity delivered safely.</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging will add more load on the system, especially on the Eastside/Bellevue area. Fund the utilities so we do not see the problems of Texas recently experience. Supporting infrastructure appropriately each and every year is required. Without this support costs will ultimately arise from shortages when we need them most. I am for the current rate increase for Puget Sound Energy. It is a sound investment for our future.</p>