

Mak, Chanda (ATG)

From: N R <bizbuzz135@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 3:41 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel; consumer@utc.wa.gov
Subject: The email to respond to UTC was wrong from PSE Dockets UE-220066. UG-220067

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

[EXTERNAL]

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.

Ref: PSE's Filing of a, 'General Rate Case,' requesting a multiyear adjustment to electric and natural gas rates.

Based on my comments below, please deny any and all of the increases in both electric and natural gas services requested by PSE.

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update the electric infrastructure in older neighborhoods in Renton, and yet it wants more and more money for the same out of date equipment, and problems associated with it - such as overloaded transformers?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 its first responsibility to its 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 has increased the capacity of high voltage wires in its 'Energize Eastside' project, and has 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 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.

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 its own benefit, increased revenue.

Nicola Robinson.