

## Public Comments by Case

**Total Comments:** 19

**In Favor:** 2

**Opposed:** 17

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Jay	E-mail	***See attachment for comment***
	Russell Preston	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Corporations do not, or should not, have a social or religious responsibility beyond serving their customers and generating profits. They should not be required to support “woke” corporate initiatives, i.e., Climate Commitment Act, DEI, ESG, CSR. While corporations are free to inject values into the workplace and support social and religious programs, they have no societal responsibility to do so. In fact, there are compelling reasons not to — just ask Anheuser Bush (Bud Light).</p> <p>This Climate Commitment Act is just another form of social activism that the state government is using to intrude themselves into what should be our private lives; to extend it’s tyranny over the widest possible range of our institutions, people, ideas, values, and beliefs. This is pure and unadulterated socialism, and it undermines the basis of a free society.</p> <p>Governor Inslee and state legislators: please reverse course on this Climate Commitment Act, and stop embracing these divisive initiatives that are ruining our state and country.</p> <p>Please respond with your thoughts on why we should support this latest example of state government overreach.</p> <p>CONTACTED:  Patty Murray  Maria Cantrell  Bob Ferguson  Jay Inslee  April Berg</p>

Ronald M Graff, MD	E-mail	<p>The CCA is taxation without representation. Washington legislators are voting for their personal interests and not the taxpayers of this state. CCA, just like the carbon tax are not saving the climate nor affecting climate change. It is taxation of energy that all taxpayers need to use. Restricting, taxing or delegating what energy taxpayers can use is wrong. Money derived from these inappropriate taxes, fees or penalties is being used for special interest projects and pet projects of our politicians. They are not affecting climate change.</p> <p>Ronald M Graff, MD Gig Harbor, WA</p>
Dan Wallem, P.E.	E-mail	<p>Hello.</p> <p>I would like to comment about the proposed natural gas and electricity rate increases for the cap and invest (trade) scheme. This whole system is a scam as there is very little carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. When I ran my thermodynamic calculations for heat balance projects at my engineering schools and professional engineering exam, I never included CO2 for the atmosphere calculations as the amount was so small (0.04%) as it was negligible compared to nitrogen (78%), oxygen (21%), and argon (1%). All this fuss for 0.04% carbon dioxide? In fact, my garden can use more CO2 as my plants have not been doing too well for the past two years. If there was more CO2, my plants would be doing better. We also notice the summer sky for the same two year period seems a bit dimmer so my plants have suffered from that as well. Anyone with a garden can tell you that this "green new scam" is just that - a scam.</p> <p>We are on a fixed pension income and energy rate increases hurt us every winter. Thank you. Dan Wallem, P.E.</p>
Jean Goodnight	E-mail	<p>Why take away natural gas? I thought this was a clean source of energy. Instead of eliminating natural gas usage from our homes, why not start by cleaning up the dirty rivers? I believe I read where two dogs died after swimming in one of our local rivers???</p> <p>Jean Goodnight</p>
Jon	E-mail	<p>All this climate commitment act stuff is nonsense. End it all. The customers are tired of it. It's a bunch of smoking mirrors to get us to pay more money.</p> <p>You are forcing us to electric vehicles and then I look at my electricity mix and most of it is coal and hydropower.... So stupid.</p> <p>Stop hiding costs and taxes, trying to leave us customers more confused about what we are paying. It's sad.</p>

			- Jon
	Michael Lisin	Web	I oppose the proposed rates scheduled to take effect on an interim basis starting January 1, 2024. The term ‘interim’ lacks specificity since there is no defined end to this period; therefore, the change appears permanent. Instead of relying solely on refunds, PSE (Puget Sound Energy) should closely monitor the actual impacts, present their findings, and then consider rate adjustments.
	Ruth Hooper	Web	<p>We must quickly reduce fossil fuel use to slow global heating. Instead of sinking hundreds of millions of dollars into a fossil fuel delivery system (fossil gas) that will serve fewer and fewer customers while continuing to leak methane and create safety hazards such as the devastating Greenwood explosion in 2016, we ask PSE to move as quickly as possible towards electrification and clean energy sources.</p> <p>Wherever possible, aging and unsafe pipelines should be replaced with these cleaner alternatives rather than new pipes. If the UTC approves PSE’s full rate increase, it will enable and reward additional investment that will ultimately become a waste of dollars funding the climate crisis rather than shrinking it.</p>
	Nancy Hansen	Web	<p>Re: UTC Docket UG-230968</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I recommend no increase to customers to help PSE cover costs for participation in the Climate Commitment Act Risk Sharing Mechanism (CCA) - the Cap and Invest Program. The only increase to customers should come from a single rate increase, as the staff from the Office of the Attorney General, Utilities and Transportation Division recommends: To consolidate Dockets UE-24000-4 and UG-24005 with Docket UG-230968. This increase needs to take into consideration the ability of people to pay increases.</p> <p>My reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is very good seeing PSE willingly participating in the program set up by the Ecology Dept. Although, we all need to pay our fair share in the transition to clean energy. I just bought a \$7,000 mini-heat pump with a \$43,000 annual income. This is hard to do. I’m (barely) able and don’t mind, as long as everyone else is chipping in, and I’m not asked for more and more to accomplish goals that are set in stone, as the public knows. PSE, their shareholders, and residential customers who can well afford to pay the costs are the main ones needing to give in a little more. We cannot leave those on natural gas with no way out, to continue as is. Does PSE sit down and really look at all these factors to make their decisions?</li> <li>2. As mentioned above, it may not happen that those without ability to pay the costs for transition are left behind. Both considering of human rights and meeting our state goals need to figure into the equation - no options on either</li> </ol>

of these.

3. I have personal reasons why I feel very negatively about PSE and problems they have caused me. These range from outages in Kitsap County, due to easily preventable causes; steering me to an HVAC solution that doesn't work and cost a huge portion of my income meant for retirement savings\*; safety issues ignored with downed lines, elderly people with no heat; attitudes of workers indicating to me that PSE was doing nothing to educate their employees on green energy, even 5 years ago; incentive programs that never amounted to any real help; customer service virtually no longer available; installation of 2 electric boxes on my property which caused a large amount of time and energy to get PSE to move in the process of installing a fence around 2-1/2 acres - I couldn't enclose a box that served other homes, but had to take a day off work, walk in unannounced at the office of the head of the Bremerton office—to get a response; and, last, school children in HUD housing near the school I served having heat turned off in cold winter weather.

\*I would like to describe my person experience with the HVAC system in detail, but will not at this time. I feel it's a very good example of many more situations than just my person one - in King County and this entire fast-growing areal. Especially with heating and cooling situations that exist in older homes needs a lot more attention.

See below for Peninsula Light chart\*\* on help for commercial building that they have built into their budget. Is PSE doing anything similar?

In total, we ask for a lot more care and investment in customers than has happened since the company became private. Being a regulation utility company doesn't mean it can be ignored that an investment in public services as vital as energy may not ignore its customers.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Nancy Hansen  
7219 NE 158th St  
Kenmore, WA 98028

\*\*Peninsula Light in Gig Harbor, a very small utility run as a coop with community members serving as board members, is currently offering incentives for commercial buildings. These are the areas that truly can lower greenhouse gas rates. Some of these: Air-source heat pump retrofit or upgrade, ductless heat pump the same, variable refrigerant flow retrofits, commercial terminal heat pump retrofits, and advanced rooftop controls. Does PSE offer any of these for commercial buildings, where the focus on building energy needs to be prioritized?  
\*\*Their incentives to regular households are available, in moderate amounts. But, when PSE offers a mini heat

		<p>pump incentive, it comes with a caveat. If you switch and have any gas in the home, all gas needs removal to get the incentive.</p> <p>I have found dead-ends in so many of the seemingly great-sounding help that PSE professes to offer to residential customers. I would rather know an honest estimate of what a company is able to do for us, vs tricks to get us to believe PSE cares about its customers. (I recall getting a PSE-sponsored person to come out and evaluate a leak in my furnace pipes. He gave me an estimate of about \$400-500. I decided to wait. In the meantime, my son happened to come by, looked at the leaks and took some duct tape to fix which took 4-5 minutes. So, all these experiences form my opinions of PSE as an untrustworthy company.)</p>	
	Peter Justus	Web	You won't need this. Just stop your attack on natural gas.
	Carla Vierra	Web	My husband and I live in Seattle and have been married for 45 years and tax paying citizens. We are very conscientious of the environment. Last we purchased a Mini split for \$30,000, we were advised this would decrease our electrical bill. It did not. The bill went up over 200.00 per month. Natural gas was whopping \$48 in the winter, per month. The U.S. has gas coming very nicely and its reliable. Who is going to pay to switch out the natural gas appliances? People who can't afford it. Our grid cannot handle all the people switching over to electric. Just look at California.
	Kristina L Irelan	Web	<p>I am not in favor of the CCA nor risk sharing. The CCA is a made up of a ridiculous time-line that currently has no way of being tracked. This fact was asked by the Seattle Times to State Representative Fitzgibbons and he acknowledged that the state has no current way to track wether the CCA's are doing anything to help the environment. The only way for this to even remotely work would be to take more than a 3rd of Eastern Washington and put windmills on all the land. But even that would not be enough. So then the state would need to harness off shore wind power. Which is really hard on our coastline because the shelf has a dramatic drop. This makes these types of wind turbines very costly. And...even if we were able to pay for that, because other countries are not doing their part, the temperature of the Earth would only drop by 1 - one hundredth of a degree. This does not seem logical. My house is heated by natural gas. That is also how I cook and shower. If the state really wants to go environmentally friendly, we need to go nuclear. Plus, the electrical grid cannot sustain the amount of people that the state wants to convert over to electricity. Also, large data centers and AI generators are consuming mass quantities of energy. We need to "fix" these other issues before we go full bore with the CCA's. So, No, I am not for risk sharing with PSE regarding the CCA's. Thank You, Kristina L Irelan</p>
	Roger Semro	Web	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am writing today in opposition of PSE request to increase natural gas and electric rates by 20 plus percent to pay for the infrastructure to make the state all electric.</p> <p>First of all we can't afford that kind of increase. It is already expensive enough to live in this state. I am 74, I still work so I can afford to pay my property taxes and live in my home that I have lived in for 50 years,</p>

Demanding that the state become all electric, I feel that I live in a dictatorship. Inslee must be delusional and think that we live in a perfect world because that is the only way I could ever imagine this would work. We don't live in a perfect world if we did the 40 million people that are still without power from Helene would have power. Think if the rescue teams were all electric or if the US was all electric how would the rescue people charge there vehicles?

Portable gas generators well that makes sense, not!

Same thing with some of our natural disasters in our state like forest fires, How are you going to get crews to the fire if they have to charge there vehicles. Not only do we know that the battery degrades in heat, cold and with age. If an electric vehicle catches fire there is basically no way to put it out. Did you see on the news of the helicopter flying over the flooded area and caught a Tesla exploding in a garage from the flood water? The State of Florida sent out a letter to all electric vehicle owners urging them to park 50 ft away from there homes incase the car explodes. How many people last year died back east in there electric cars that got stuck on the freeway in the winter storms?

One of my customers who work's for Microsoft, him and his team's sole job is to protect the US Government from Russian Hackers. Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq and I am sure there are way more that are looking for ways to cripple our power grid. When we have natural gas we can still heat our homes with a small 2000w generator and plug the furnace into it, we have hot water the basics. If we are all electric the size and cost of a generator to power a furnace or heat pump would be very expensive and how would be power the generator? Gas, natural gas, diesel? I was out of power during a winter storm a few years ago for a week and I live in Sumner city limits. I fired up my little Honda generator and had the basics so I could survive. If I was all electric I would have been screwed. Earlier this years I was out of power for 19 hours when a car hit a power pole and it didn't even knock the power pole down. It was just leaning but they shut the power off to our neighbor hood. Once Potelco arrived it took them less than 2 hours to fix the problem. This incident happened at 8pm and my power came back on at 3pm the next day. I have my little generator so I was not in the dark or uncomfortable.

The head of the Department of Energy in front of Congress told them that it is impossible to have the US all electric. There are just not enough electrical capacities and that is not a feasible idea, He said we need all forms of energy to keep the US prosperous and safe.

In the winter time when we have power outages how are the people going to stay warm? What if we are without power for a week and the temperatures are below freezing the amount of damage to homes and apartments is going to be astronomical just with frozen pipes.

Trying to go all electric is a very bad idea and just pipe dream for our Governor. Billions of tax payer's dollars are wasted.

If the Biden Administration and Governor Inslee are so concerned with climate change then why does the US send

			<p>millions of tons of coal thru our state to Delta Port at West Shore terminal in Canada to ship to the largest air polluter in the world China? Multiple coal trains pass my shop daily along with the other set of track on the other side of town. Yesterday I counted 113 coal cars while I waited at the tracks and that was a small train, only 2 locomotives. I have seen trains with 3 locomotives pulling 2 in the center and one pushing. I have sat for 7 minutes waiting for the train to clear well over 350 cars. It get better when the coal cars are uncovered I am told that they loose one pound of coal dust per mile. Those coal trains travel along the Columbia and thru populated areas and in Kent next to schools. Coal miners got black lung disease. These uncovered coal cars and the dust they leave can not be good for the Columbia River, fish or us.</p> <p>Wind mills are horrible for the environment. They have a 20 year life span; there is no way to dispose of the blades. They are not recyclable. The ones that were built 20 years ago are at the end of the life span and blades are breaking. I would like to know what was the cost to build and maintain windmills versus the revenue they produced. Cost of electricity from wind it about four time higher than hydro. Cost of hydro is about 4 cent a KW, wind is about 16 cents a KW. Can you afford to pay virtually 4 times what you pay now for electricity?</p> <p>I was sent a questionnaire if I would like to put storage batteries in my business. This is really a bad idea. Battery put off fumes, weather charging or discharging. Battery fumes can cause brain cancer and there is no way to safely dispose of them once they reach there life expectancy, if they catch fire you can't put them out and I am sure there are other issues.</p> <p>So now that I am done explaining this all electric plan is not good for the tax payers and the cost versus reward is just not there. Please do not allow this huge and unprecedented price increase.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Roger Semro</p>
	Liz Campbell	Web	<p>"We must quickly reduce fossil fuel use to slow global heating. Instead of sinking hundreds of millions of dollars into a fossil fuel delivery system (fossil gas) that will serve fewer and fewer customers while continuing to leak methane and create safety hazards such as the devastating Greenwood explosion in 2016, we ask PSE to move as quickly as possible towards electrification and clean energy sources.</p> <p>Wherever possible, aging and unsafe pipelines should be replaced with these cleaner alternatives rather than new pipes. If the UTC approves PSE's full rate increase, it will enable and reward additional investment that will ultimately become a waste of dollars funding the climate crisis rather than shrinking it."</p>
	Sleepless (and Cold)	Web	Governor Jay Inslee signed Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1589 (ESHB 1589). He did so despite the growing calls for a veto. Critics say the new law's final language primarily benefits Puget Sound Energy at the expense of

In Seattle		<p>customers. Because of the bill's emergency clause, it took effect immediately. Those against it say that means ratepayers are about to get hit HARD, as you can see. As it stands, PSE must generate 80% of its energy from renewable energy sources by 2030 and 100% by 2045. This sets the stage for a total statewide natural gas ban and will drastically inflate utility rates for everyone, as homeowners and businesses will have to bear the cost of converting from gas to electricity. The bill states that, by 2027, PSE must, "achieve all cost-effective electrification of end uses currently served by natural gas." The legislation apparently offers some financial assistance to lower-income homeowners, but the money can't be used to replace gas appliances or make other home modifications. This bill imposes ridiculous increases in pricing which are passed onto PSE's customers. The Building Industry Association of Washington (BIAW) estimates PSE's residential customers will face a cost of \$7 billion to \$10 billion converting to electricity, with average costs expected to be about \$40,000 per home. Plus, those living in older home will face even higher costs when upgrading due to outdated equipment like electrical panels, wiring, etc. The middle class are being squeezed beyond their means, once again, and some even out of their homes.</p> <p>I urge voters to pass Initiative 2066 on the ballot in November. This Initiative would prohibit state and local governments from restricting access to natural gas and would prohibit the state building code council from prohibiting, penalizing and discouraging the use of natural gas in any building. If passed, it would also require gas companies, utility company, etc. to provide it to any person and/or corporation even if other energy services or sources may be available to them. The Washington UTC will be prohibited from approving a multi-year rate plan requiring or incentivizing a natural gas utility company to get rid of natural gas services. They also cannot implement requirements that would make natural gas services cost-prohibitive.</p> <p>These strict environmental policies are directly affecting the middle class once again. Low income homeowners can receive assistance, but here is no help for the middle class. The typical increases they cite are not even close to what we will be forced to pay to heat our home. We already pay between \$900 to \$1,000 a month to heat our home in the cold winter months, which is absolutely ridiculous. We have already replaced our furnace and heat pump in the last year or two, which was between \$25,000.00 and \$30,000.00.</p> <p>According to Dave Danner at WUTC, the hearing for the proposed rate increases is scheduled to be heard on November 4th and 5th, which would be a waste of time if Initiative 2066 passes on November 5th, thereby rendering this moot. At least that is how I understand this. Why not wait for the voting results BEFORE conducting a hearing.</p> <p>Also, FYI, your website returned the error when I tried to submit this form the first time: "An error has occurred. Please check back later. Sorry for any inconvenience." This appears just another way to NOT hear public comments. Thankfully, I saved my writing in a Word document before sending. But how awfully frustrating to have to resubmit this form -- especially if the entire comment was deleted and you have to retype it a second (or third) time. Let's hope this one goes through . . . .</p> <p>Sources:</p>
------------	--	---



			<p><a href="https://mynorthwest.com/3956123/inslee-signs-natural-gas-bill-into-law-critics-say-it-comes-at-expense-of-customers/">https://mynorthwest.com/3956123/inslee-signs-natural-gas-bill-into-law-critics-say-it-comes-at-expense-of-customers/</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.krem.com/article/news/politics/elections/elections-2024/four-initiatives-november-ballot-washington/293-b74d27c7-923b-4980-a8e0-8822cd951ea8">https://www.krem.com/article/news/politics/elections/elections-2024/four-initiatives-november-ballot-washington/293-b74d27c7-923b-4980-a8e0-8822cd951ea8</a></p>
	arlen notch	Web	The CCA is an unnecessary cost to the US, states and PSE unless all countries, including China, can agree to the same commitment. Therefore, passing on CCA costs to PSE electric and gas users is unwarranted, as are rate increases.
	Nola Coston	E-mail	<p>NO tax increases.</p> <p>Unlimited clean energy is in nuclear fusion, not in capping greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Nola Coston</p>
Yes			
	Lioubov boujor	E-mail	<p>Gentlemen:</p> <p>I am FOR the Risk Sharing Mechanism that Puget Sound Energy is proposing.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lioubov boujor Issaquah,WA</p>
	Valerie Tarico	E-mail	<p>Greetings -</p> <p>I just want to express my appreciation for the work you are doing to make the Climate Commitment Act work for all of us. I know the upfront costs and challenges can be difficult even though the long-term ROI is very clear.</p> <p>Sincerely, Valerie</p>