

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: kabannon54@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, October 1, 2023 12:28 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov; ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Cc: customercare@pse.com
Subject: docket UG230393 and other matters

[EXTERNAL]

The proposal should be denied. Reason: North America contains more than enough gas reserves to satisfy continental energy needs for many years. Enough energy supplies are easily obtainable for better prices by PSE in Western Canada and the Rocky Mountain States of the USA that are cheaper and safer than Liquefied Natural Gas, LNG, offloaded at a terminal in Tacoma. Unlike LNG, there is no national security issue of possible maritime disruption or delivery contract nullification due to an international instability.

Look to the actions of the international gas market in regards to the actions of the Russian Republic, where customers have been cut off, and it is obvious energy in the international arena is risky. I will add also where is also the moral imperative for avoiding purchasing supplies from countries that don't respect human rights nor the environment. We do a much better job of that in North America while furthermore we support strong union families.

Piped continental supply, under the full control of the USA or of our closest international allies, is far more secure. To that end inclusion of Alaskan supplies are more effectively and with less environmental impact secured by tying Alaska production fields to the rest of the North American pipeline system. It is sad that confused agendas are pushing out market signals and better public interest policy. It is preferable for state and federal officials to reset and insure the best energy transportation and production network is in place. One that welcomes all kinds of energy sources, away from policies that lead to worse problems in the future.

This is an opportune time to put focus on supply. Current policies and laws are putting all future supplies of energy in question. As far as electrical resources, important to Washingtonians as well as the success of Puget Sound Energy, authoritative sources still show the local power grid is in danger both in terms of infrastructure and peak supply. Already customers are being asked to shut down usage during peak events and it is only a matter of time before we start seeing brownouts. Which leads one to ask, why are we talking about just this instead of more sources of all energy?

In regards to carbon based fuels, in spite of public policy, the fact is demand will increase for many years in Washington State – which of course is why we're having this conversation. So while it is nice to see PSE is working proactively on the matter of carbon fuel supply, it's still not the best plan to import LNG—always the most expensive option. To say it again in case it wasn't understood the first time, more risky and are more expensive. Adding also pipelines, though not without their risks, are safer than wheeled and maritime transport. To repeat, a LNG terminal and a couple pennies on the bill does not solve the problem. Why aren't we discussing securing all sources of carbon fuel as well as securing the electrical grid? Nothing is worse than having one's back on the core problem by avoidance or pretending. Just leads to turmoil and worse problems in the future.

In regards to public welfare PSE and the state of Washington have already failed. The climate commitment act has imposed needless and hurtful hardship on customers. There is also plenty more blame to go around. Certainly national governments around the world have done so much to increase taxes and throttle supplies. Yet you the members of the commission and the leadership of PSE shouldn't stand by and wring your hands of it. You can and should be doing the right thing by urging our elected officials to make better policy and legislation.

There are also things you can do yourself. When the carbon fee was imposed, this commission said it was Ok to cover up the costs from the paying public, who you are supposed to advocate for and protect by the way, those costs on our bills. When is it OK to cover up fees? Duh! Never! Shame to the AG! While it seems of little consequence, such is never the case. There will always be anger and pushback—maybe not now, but it will happen. The best thing to do is to quietly do the right thing and send out bills with the carbon tax itemized.

I could go on, but you got the gist of things. Here's the summary:

1. Energy production shortages are worse than people like to admit and not admitting that is just going to make the turmoil worse. LNG is not a solution and bringing it up is a distraction. Moreover people are already being badly hurt and the hurt can and will be far worse. Sadly we are setting ourselves up as we are not dealing well with energy supply issues. It is better to stop and get on the right track. I will feel better when I see the UTC's agenda focused on increasing supplies of electrical energy, carbon fuels, nuclear and hydro energy—the things that will carry our citizens. Wind, electron panels, hydrogen, batteries, etc. have a place, but can't do the whole job.
2. Energy costs are already hurting people and an LNG terminal just adds to the burden rather than help. As a nation we must accept all cheap forms of energy including the carbon kind, nuclear, and hydro are necessary. It is more effective to mitigate the consequences of carbon fuels than to move forward without carbon fuel.
3. Energy self-sufficiency is often preferable. Sometimes energy self-sufficiency is more expense, but often not. The key problem is when outside providers are no longer reliable, trustworthy or able to deliver, (and there is a long, sad history of failure by outside energy producers) are the inevitable disruptive consequences which are traumatic.

Kevin Bannon
Seatac, WA

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: bierijd@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, October 7, 2023 6:29 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: PSA rate increase

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

Members of the utility commission hello,

We have received a notification from PSE that they request the approval of a rate increase to cover their costs of developing and constructing an LNG facility in Tacoma.

We strongly believe that asking for this increase is an impertinence. Why should consumers pay for a facility from which PSE will derive profits, probably large ones?

I wonder whether you will approve this request since it seems that you regularly approve all the requests of PSE. To the best of my knowledge, the recent request for a rate increase was approved in spite of the objection of our well informed state attorney general, Mr. Ferguson.

I wonder if you will respond to our message and explain your proposed actions.

Sincerely,

Isaiah & Debbie Bier



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: julieabrown@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 5:12 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Objection to the proposed PSE rate increase for construction of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility; Docket UG-230393

Importance: High

[EXTERNAL]

It is my understanding that your office is representing the public's interest in the proposed rate increase by PSE for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility. As a member of the public and a PSE natural gas customer, I object to the proposed rate increase by PSE for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility as follows:

1. To the extent this facility is meant to primarily serve the Tacoma/Pierce County/South Sound region, that region should bear a greater portion of the construction and development costs than those outside its service area. They are the recipients benefitted by its construction and so should carry a greater share of the cost.
2. The schedule provided shows that residential customers will bear a greater percentage increase in their bill than commercial customers. This is unacceptable and unfair. Commercial customers are much better suited to pay for rate increases than residential customers. The greater impact should NOT fall on the shoulders of the little guy. Residential consumers are getting priced out of being able to afford basic living necessities such as food, housing, and heat. PSE should not be allowed to increase their burden even more when Commercial customers are far more able to afford this price increase. Commercial customers should bear a greater share of this cost than residential customers, not the other way around.

Sincerely,
Julie Brown
King County resident
PSE natural gas customer

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Marilyn Cornwell <mmcornwell@live.com>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 1:30 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: re Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

From: [Marilyn Cornwell](#)
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 1:23 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov
Subject: re Docket UG-230393

To whom it may concern:

As a Puget Sound Energy customers and persons of faith we vehemently oppose PSE's proposed Schedule 141LNG Rate Adjustment, Schedule 141D Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recovery Adjustment and Schedule 141N Rate Adjustment.

First, PSE's LNG plant in Tacoma was built improperly and illegally on Puyallup land and does not honor Puyallup Nation treaty rights that are actually the law of the United States. Second, the improper building of the LNG plant did not take into account the environmental impacts for the tribes, schools and communities that are in the path of the possible blast zone, which is larger than PSE admits. Third, LNG production involves climate desecration from when its precursor is fracked, then transported by rail, and ultimately processed.

Furthermore, the product of the LNG plant is being shipped overseas, so we will not be the beneficiaries anyway. As almost all of the technical details will be ultimately automated, proposing that there will be an increase in a few jobs is specious reasoning.

The underhanded and political sleight-of-hand machinations that resulted in the LNG plant's construction and future operations should NOT be paid for by PSE customers and state taxpayers. It is an outrage to us that these adjustments are seriously being considered.

We implore you to deny the propose adjustments included in Docket UG-230393. It is our moral and spiritual obligation to stop this in its tracks.

Sincerely,

The Rev. Canon Marilyn Cornwell, Ph.D., 206-236-0287
and
Dr. Robert Cornwell, Ph.D., PE., 206-321-6786

9010 SE 47th St.
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Bill Downing <downing@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 4:55 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Dcument UG-230393

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

I am apposed to this rate increase. Monies needed to build new capital projects should be provided out of the new revenue provided by those projects.

Thanks for asking,
William Downing

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Virginia Gunderson <lvgunder@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 9:53 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

Public Counsel

Now is not the time to raise rates. Too many of us are struggling to feed our families. Some are having to choose between medicines and groceries. With winter coming how many will suffer with little or no heat?
NOW IS NOT THE TIME!

Virginia Gunderson

Sent from my iPad

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Nancy Hansen <nancy@glenwood-gardens.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2023 6:37 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Fwd: Comment for Docket UG-230393 (Schedule 141LNG - Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment)
Attachments: Tacoma LNGDocket UG-230393.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

I am forwarding my comment made on the Tacoma LNG plant re customer's participation in paying the costs for construction and development of this facility.

I was not clear if I should also be sending my comment to the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington Office of the Attorney General, so decided to forward it on to you. (I submitted a comment October 31, below, to Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

Thank you.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nancy Hansen <nancy@glenwood-gardens.com>
Subject: Comment for Docket UG-230393 (Schedule 141LNG - Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment)
Date: October 31, 2023 at 11:04:02 PM PDT
To: comment@utc.wa.gov

To Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
Re Docket UG-230393

Comment submitted by:
Nancy Hansen
7219 NE 158th St
Kenmore WA 98028
nancy@glenwood-gardens.com

Docket UG-230393

Re Comments Schedule 141LNG-Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment

There are far too many reasons for my opposition as a customer, being asked to fund the Tacoma LNG facility. What PSE gains from this facility goes to them, not to me. I became sorry I wanted to cook on gas and got this to my home as I fixed it up to live in. After finding the gas blackened bricks on my fireplace up nearly to the ceiling, after natural gas powered “logs” were installed for extra heat, I wish I had never even considered natural gas in the first place. It’s all been a very bad experience.

I was an original opponent of the Tacoma LNG Facility project from the beginning. I attended the packed public hearing that lasted an entire day. I was not able to hear the entire testimony but did definitely see the ones in favor could be counted on the fingers of one hand. These were mostly corporate people connected to the project and set to benefit financially. The public more than clearly indicated they did not believe this project was in the best interests for the long-term energy situation.

I had first understood that the gas would be going to China to manufacture plastics for the U.S. That story in a prominent news source was not repeated again. So PSE’s story has now changed, it appears a large amount will be going for shipping fuel. This is a time when the shipping industry is changing to green energy. PSE seems to always be behind the way the world is going - is this intentional? Puget Sound customers are fed up with it.

Reasons why this facility should never have gone through to begin:

1) I am sincerely concerned about the future of my grandchildren and all the others who may likely continue the pattern of disease due to pollution that was not at this extent when I grew up. And, of course, this is far higher and more dangerous in communities that are exposed to greater amounts. It is difficult to live and work when a person is not healthy, along with the fact they are discriminated against as far as receiving help for a way to survive.

2) I am very angry that the Puyallup Tribe has lost more than they had in earlier days. The land they have now is mostly barely suitable for most uses and, with the infrastructure that was warned against prior to the passage of the GMA, then went in immediately afterwards, this land is littered with signs warning of routes out if the mountain goes. The tribe has been doing well with the casino, but now the entire area is changed - industrial ugly and uninviting, as well as a place where people think pollution when in the area. How much more can be done by corporations to totally destroy a civilization?

2) There have been extensive flaws in the process that allowed this facility to go ahead:

- As I mentioned above, the public overwhelmingly said NO. People do not turn out for any old thing, but this one was of great importance to stop, according to a very large number of people in the Tacoma-Federal Way-Seattle areas. Maybe corporations don’t, but most people think long-term for the most important issues. Today, one of those 2 important issues is climate change.
- PSE went ahead before all permits were approved. What kind of privileges is this company allowed?
- In addition to that, the process involved only very weak agencies that granted the approvals - the Pollution Control Hearings Board and PSCAA had no consultation with other agencies at state level that should have been involved since the moves that PSE has made, and continues to make, are in direct opposition to the decisions that have been made by Washington Legislature on energy use. (This did not all happen recently and PSE likely knew

and went ahead anyway. I read that the Pollution Control Hearings Board did not even address any of the effects that WILL affect climate change. They failed to address the whole factual picture.)

I am ashamed that regulatory controls in Washington are so far behind in a process that started years and years ago.

3) I have little trust in PSE. I know their rates were higher in the '90's than 2 nearby public systems - Peninsula Light in Gig Harbor - and also PUD#3 in Mason County. I experienced service from both of these companies of high quality. I received service that helped my air circulation, heat savings, and actually, helped with a hole to the outside where a board was missing in one house. Years later, Peninsula Light stood by their policies and fixed it for me since it occurred during install of my furnace. In contrast, I call PSE for the services they say they provide, but end up with a young sassy employee who knows literally nothing. And, the services turn out not to be available after all. (This last time, I finally signed up for services at King County for my energy needs, but they are so overloaded, likely due to the needs that PSE does not fill, or care to fill, that the waiting list is so terribly long.)

In addition, I had no idea so much of the job of new gas installation was subsidized until I requested gas for a remodel about 9 years ago. After the installation, I got a knock on the door one day - a company associated with PSE was there to do tests to make sure the system was safe. I'm not sure if this is done with all new installs, but this got me thinking maybe it was the line they couldn't find when they went to install. It took a total of 3 solid work days to finally get to the line that was serving a neighbor. This neighbor had smaller diameter pipes than the new ones put on for my install. All together, I became very skeptical of the PSE work, not even doing maintenance adequately to know where their own lines exist. To top it off, they covered the 3rd or 4th of the holes dug in the street with a rounded berm, so I had to call to get them to fix this. They weren't going to do it, but I think a neighbor must have complained as well since they back out onto this area, and that seemed to get PSE to change their minds. I'm sorry I ever even thought natural gas, but plan to replace with all electric, soon as I can get funds to buy a new water heater and stove, and hopefully get my furnace to start on all electric.

Quality of work with PSE is a subject with lots of questions. All they seem to want is to install more and more to get natural gas locked in for years to come. Of course, this is precisely opposite of what should be happening now.

Living in rural Port Orchard, WA, I experienced extreme incompetence with PSE, in addition. We were without electricity, meaning wells not working for all in our area, for 2 solid weeks at one time. It took many years later for PSE to realize all they would have had to do was trim branches away from the lines. They were working on the electricity for a bridge that had gone down in this area and the lines got trimmed awhile afterwards. Maybe a neighbor pointed out the branches laying across lines, I don't know. But, obviously, no one from PSE had ever come in person to check the area while we experience outages on a regular basis for years. They spent all their time going to doors to make sure we all agreed on meters that self-reported - to lower their expenses, of course - actually the only thing we've ever seen from PSE after the company was privatized.

4) A big fact that I bet PSE understands very well, but doesn't want to talk about it: LNG is actually worse for climate change in the shorter term. It heats up at a far higher temperature than gas.* It is within this short term that we need to lower temperatures so they don't go over a threshold that will put more life at risk. Not being able to do this due to projects such as the Tacoma LNG Facility will definitely cause temperatures to rise, meaning increased death for many more vegetable and animal species, including humans. In sum, liquid natural gas will cause far more destruction than any good it could ever bring, within this 10- or so year period of its life in the atmosphere. The timing is all wrong, and the decision for allowing permits to build this plant were extremely flawed.

*This is not to say use gas instead since the length of time in the atmosphere is 10 times that of LNG. It means cut fossil fuels.

5) Another argument is the one about interim fuels. This is also faulty since there is no reason why more solar and wind cannot be deployed. Already the industry is becoming large and communities are benefiting. Why did this have to happen in the town where I was born? I am very upset and angry due to all the work many, including me, have done to save Puget Sound, especially the Tacoma Tideflats and the clean-up of slag out in the Sound years ago. For a century when we should know better, this is one of the worst examples I can imagine of being totally out of touch.

6) Address the dollar as the only measure is also a flawed argument. Regulatory agencies should have figured this one out, if they are truly working for the good of Washington. Think extra health costs due to toxic emissions, for one. The costs to the environment can't be totaled in dollars because they will go on for years to come. Think costs of fracking itself - the water required, the value of the land where fracking is done, destroyed for other uses such as food crops, or housing. When the water is bad, the land becomes useless. EPIC, Uof Chicago, focused on economics alone, even admits in a 2018 study on costs and benefits of fracking in a fracking community, for the average household, "...benefits...worth about \$2,000 per year." But, "If people's understanding of the health impacts were to change, it is likely this would alter the net benefits of allowing fracking." ("Fracking Has Its Costs and Benefits" Michael Greenstone, Forbes, 2/20/2018).

7) I could say many more things, but one thing that sticks in my mind about the attitudes and feeling that come out of PSE for customers was the way their employees appear to be brainwashed to actually believe natural gas is clean. I asked one day when the trucks were in the neighborhood after the fiasco trying to find the gas line described above, "Why do you use the words "Clean" and "Green" on your trucks?" The employees claimed it was clean and also made a few smart-a remarks. I did not appreciate the way I was addressed and their attitudes of superiority and putting customers down. I was asking an honest question and wanted to know what PSE was trying to project to both their employees and to their entire customer base. I always like to hear both sides. They actually didn't come up with any real facts that justified what they told me, however.

Obviously, beyond the fact I am not actually able to support more for my heat, mainly due to the fact that Social Security has never given actual cost of living increases - that is until right after Covid for the first time ever. Our costs are based on only the necessities and a new roof doesn't figure in that, for one simple example. That was a corporate new rule in more recent years. I keep thinking, why me to foot a cost of doing business? PSE will benefit from it, not me.

More important, although, is the fact that more natural gas will only keep us from being able to get a handle on temperatures rising. So, thanks to PSE, for one, we can continue to expect more fires, periods of extreme heat, along with pollution in the air. I am also angry about the Tacoma LNG Facility having been approved after customers spoke out against this project so clearly far before any moves were made.

Not relating to this, but costs to the customer do cause it to relate to the public impressions:

The Cap and Trade program developed by Washington Dept. of Ecology was a choice for corporations and is a program where the companies will eventually benefit in the long run. Why is PSE making it appear to be a "compliance instrument"? This was a corporate choice as far as I understood after having attending planning meetings at Ecology.

It would be so much better if PSE could operate on a truthful level with the public. If this had been presented before, rather than after the fact that we will be billed for it, I am certain, after seeing other similar choices, that customers would not object at all to putting money into what we need to do to keep temperatures from going higher, with electric, etc. I hope that PSE is able to cut itself off from the fossil fuel industry and behave like a normal utility by serving the public as they should be doing.

Thank you for the opportunity to say these things that fester in all of our minds on a regular basis.

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Norm Haynes <n.haynes@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 7:06 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Fwd: 3.5% Increase P Sound Energy LNG SALES

[EXTERNAL]

Please clarify where I am wrong?!

* what does "Tacoma LNG Facility" mean???????

Does that mean a giant transfer container storage thingy being built to SEND LNG to CHINA or Elsewhere? OR is it for UNLOADING Giant LNG Ships that transport LNG to a Tacoma facility so that it can be supplied to U.S.A. Businesses & Consumers???????????

WHICH WAY IS THE LNG GOING IN OTHER WORDS?

* Is PSE's main THING to sell LNG to Regular Every Day People who then use it to power their GAS FURNACE, GAS WATER HEATER, GAS STOVE/OVEN, GAS Clothes DRYER ETC at a profit? OR is their primary mission something else?

* Last time i checked the U.S.A. GOV is hell bent on NOT allowing the sale or use of "Dinosaur" types of stuff burning like "gas", Natural Gas, Fossil Fuels IN OTHER WORDS.

* WHAT IS PSE's "STANCE" on GOV working against them ??? PSE has NEVER answered me on that.

* SO - WHY THE F do every day consumers need to help build a ginourmous TACOMA transfer facility?????????????????????

* SEATTLE GOV has already made it ILEAGAL to install Natural Gas Meters for NEW CONSTRUCTION of HOUSES ETC.

* BRANDON is HELL BENT on increasing the cost of ALL APPLIANCES while at the same time makeing them last LESS LONG. WORK CRAPIER.

****IN OTHER WORDS - DOUBLE FLUSH DISH WASHERS That take 3 hours to run a cycle and leave your dishes soaking wet. Clothes DRYERS (GAS) that take 90 minutes to dry your clothes. Natural Gas WATER HEATERS that cost \$2,000 or more dollars. HIGH EFFICIENT N. GAS FURNACES THAT COST \$15,000 TO INSTALL BECAUSE THEY ARE SO FREAKING COMPLICATED.

* So GOV is working against PSE's mission which I assume is to sell MORE natural GAS at as High A Price as Possible - NO?

*BRANDON BLOWS UP A N GAS PIPELINE OFF THE COAST OF EUROPE CAUSING MASSIVE RELEASE OF CO2 and WASTE of Millions of Gallons of LNG. BRANDON CANCELING PIPELINES & PROJECTS AND NOT ALLOWING ANY NEW SOURCES OF FUEL EXCEPT FOR COAL POWERED ELECTRIC PLANTS - PREFERRABLY IN CHINA

*** SERIOUSLY WHAT THE FUCK ARE "WE" DOING!***

Sincerly, Norm Haynes - paying PSE since 1994. PSE CUSTOMER # 200006488874
15816 - 34 AVE NE LK FOR PARK WA 98155

**** THANKS FOR NOTHING -- nothing ANY OF YOU DO MAKES ANY GD SENSE.

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Michael Helm <mghelm@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:40 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: (No Subject)

[EXTERNAL]

Hello, I am responding to the proposed rate increase for Puget Sound Energy. Over the past year or so, our cost for natural gas provided by PSE has doubled. Inquiries into this indicate this increase is not commensurate with expenses incurred by PSE for obtaining or producing natural gas, but rather due to the global market as a whole, which has seen soaring prices for natural gas, primarily caused by the conflict in the Ukraine, i.e. PSE is charging us a price consistent with what they are able to obtain on the overall market, and because they can. I find this completely unacceptable. I have used natural gas for heat for many years, because gas heats much faster than electricity, and the reasonable cost. I purchased a new gas furnace a few years ago, but am now sorry I did so as a heat pump powered by electricity now seems like a more prudent alternative. PSE didn't obtain permission to steeply increase the rates for natural gas consumption, and it seems pretty hypocritical to ask for this increase. I strongly oppose this request from PSE, and hope that it is not approved.

Sincerely,
Michael Helm

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: kiversonpt@aol.com
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 11:31 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Puget Sound Energy rate increase

[EXTERNAL]

Hello

I am voicing my opinion on Puget Sound Energy's request for residential use rate increases. Docket UG 230 393.

I appreciate that my energy use is easy and convenient but am really tired of being nickel and dimed from all stages of purchases with the current inflationary pricing.

Please stay this rate request.

Thank you
Kathy Iverson

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Jeff JORDAN <jaeffjordan@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2023 10:27 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov
Cc: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: PSE must actually change!

[EXTERNAL]

For too long, PSE has been living on coal, and is now trying to transfer its carbon dependence to LNG. It is necessary that this gigantic utility be forced to actually invest in sustainable forms of energy generation.

*Thank you,
Jeff Jordan
WA 98117*

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Karissa P <pkarissa@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 11:29 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: This proposal from PSE is outrageous

[EXTERNAL]

I am NOT in favor of any price hikes. We're a family of 4. June-October we have our furnace off, so its just the water heater. We pay 35.00-40.00 per month. The rest of the year its 80- 100.00+ per month. Majority of that is "service fees and Delivery fees" The gas we used was \$12.00. With their service fee 12.50 per month I think this would take care of any and all updates to their system. After all this is why we pay more in fees, then we do in gas.

This is supposed to be a Non profit. Right?!?
Maybe the CEO can NOT get a 3.6 million dollar bonus?!? 🙄

As President and Chief Executive Officer at PUGET SOUND ENERGY INC, Mary E. Kipp made \$4,760,931 in total compensation. Of this total \$991,585 was received as a salary, \$3,681,668 was received as a bonus. \$87,678 came from other types of compensation.

This is CRAZY! Rich keep getting richer and the rest of us are paying for it.

Thank you for your time,
Karissa P

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Yen <yenla9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:35 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Fwd: Ref: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

To Whom it may concern:

I am a Puget Sound Energy customer. I don't support the UG-230393. I don't see how it benefits the customers because we are already paying for the Climate Commitment Act. Why do we need to fund it? As of October 1st, Puget Sound Energy already increased another rate for the Climate Commitment Act.

No rate increase!

Thanks,
Yen La

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Vicki Lockwood <ldlockwood@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 9:01 AM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov; ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-230393

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

UTC Commission Members and Public Counsel,

I do not think PSE should be granted any rate increase for their costs to develop, construct and operate the Tacoma LNG Facility. I do not believe this facility is necessary for their peak shaving needs today or in the foreseeable future. Our nation has decided to decrease its consumption of carbon-emitting fuels, and our state has been a leader in this effort. Thus, as the renewable energy effort unfolds, future consumption of natural gas in our region should decrease. In addition, PSE chose several years ago not to continue their operation and maintenance of a propane-air peak shaving facility that they had in Renton ... if peak shaving is a legitimate concern of PSE, they could have upgraded that facility and invested their rate-payers' money in a system where the piping and infrastructure was already in place.

I believe the Tacoma LNG Facility is unnecessary and nothing more than a business decision that was originally conceived with the notion that they could market their LNG to large users and other natural gas distribution companies and that the facility would be rate neutral to its residential customers. Unfortunately, that future marketability has disappeared so now they want their existing customer base to pay for the poor timing of their boondoggle concept.

If they are granted any rate increase for this facility, I ask that as a minimum they provide an exemption to the senior citizens in their existing rate base. This would not necessarily be a costly exemption to implement ... some utilities already provide special rates for seniors who have been granted property-tax exemptions. They could easily use that same criteria to determine which of their customers would be eligible for the LNG exemption.

Thank you for considering my input.

Vicki Lockwood
4235 S 164 St
SeaTac, Wa 98188

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Mark W Mahaffey <mark.w.mahaffey@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2023 3:38 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

Public Comment Hearing for PSE's LNG Rate Adjustment

We'll be rooting for you!

Mark Mahaffey
Olympia WA 98512

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Joe Mancuso <choman98@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 5:13 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: PSE's requested LNG rate adjustment: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

We are residential natural gas customers of Puget Sound Energy. Our address is: 2819 62 ST CT, Gig Harbor 98335. Phone: 253-709-2880.

We are confused as to why residential natural gas customers are being asked to reimburse PSE for the construction and other costs associated with the LNG plant constructed in Tacoma. What benefit is there to us. Our understanding was that the LNG plant was being constructed to provide an alternative fuel for container ships utilizing the Port of Tacoma. Are we wrong in this assumption? How arrogant of PSE. Reminds us of Enron. Regardless, we totally oppose the rate hike for residential customers. We hope your office will look out for the interests of residential customers and deny the rate increase to our NG rates.

Joe and Faye Mancuso

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: FRED MATTFIELD <skipife@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 4:20 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: reference Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

I do not see an increase for most of the lowest rate customers, all transportation related; NG schedule 31T, 41T, 85T, 86T, and 87T, most of which are already subsidized with our tax dollars. It makes sense to me that only increasing there rate alone would cover all expenses and there would not be a need for a rate increase for residential customers.

Skip

<>

Psalm 118:8
Lakewood, WA

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Kathy McFall <kmcfb@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 3:51 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov
Cc: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

Regarding **Docket UG-230393**

I am responding to the notice of a rate "adjustment" by PSE to help them pay for the LNG plant that no one I know considered a good idea.

The Puyallup Tribe, Redefine Tacoma, Communities for a Healthy Bay, and Sierra Club, along with other organizations all fought this project. I fought it personally through countless hours composing emails and participating in protests. An LNG plant in this heavily populated region on the shores of the Salish Sea, in an earthquake and lahar zone, was a horrible idea, and now it is a horrible reality. I'm a homeowner within the blast zone, where I've lived for over 25 years.

Disregarding public safety, ecology, and possibly the legality of situating this monstrosity on tribal land, PSE forged ahead **for profit**.

And now PSE wants to charge me more so I can pay for their mistake? Everyone else has to pay for their own mistakes. PSE should be no exception.

Kathy McFall-Butler

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: LORINDA PADGETT <loriandlucky@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2023 1:39 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel; comments@utc.wa.gov
Subject: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

Why are residents of Snohomish County, and other counties paying for the increase costs for a development, construction and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility. We do not live in Tacoma. Seems like this should be a Pierce County increase, not everyone that uses Puget Sound Energy gas.

Lorinda Padgett
2514 85th Dr N E unit y-3
Lake Stevens, Wa 98258
425-322-3009

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Peg Ponack <pegbp2@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 6, 2023 3:30 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov
Cc: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel; customercare@pse.com
Subject: Docket UG-230393

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

RE: Docket UG-230393T

Hello,

I'm submitting my comment regarding the natural gas rate adjustment for Puget Sound Energy.

I am a retired 70-year-old resident of Snohomish County. I have lived in the same house for 17 years and I love it here. However, now that I am retired I have no earning power at all. I can't work extra hours to make extra money and I can't take extra money out of my retirement account, unless I want to shorten my life expectancy. I have no one to borrow from, no way to repay, and no ability to increase my bank account.

However, every week at the grocery store something has increased in price, and usually not by a small amount. I was just informed by my insurance company that my auto insurance on my 16 year old vehicle is more than doubling. My health insurance no longer covers my vision.

I understand how corporate profits work. I was a CPA for many years. I understand that the costs of doing business may be rising as well. I feel compelled though, to offer my opinion on these continual price increases. I can't afford it! Perhaps your executives could donate a small portion of their bonuses to helping out folks like myself, who are barely making ends meet on a monthly basis. My house needs many repairs that are not getting done. There are many honest folks who are not doing as well as I am. Last year, when my natural gas heating bill increased, I decreased the temperature setting for my house from 67 to 66 degrees. That's not very warm! My bill still exceeded \$110 per month. That's a lot for me.

I don't want to have to give up something in order to have heat this winter. Do I go without auto insurance? Or should I just not eat one day per week? I have already postponed purchasing a new couch to replace my worn out 22 year old one. I don't know what else I can sacrifice and I didn't intend for my retirement to be quite so austere.

I apologize if this message seems overly selfish to you, but please consider what you are asking for and how it may affect all of your customers. I know that a lot of people won't respond, and I never have before, but please! How much of this do you think I (we) can take?

Sincerely,

Peg B Ponack, CPA retired

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Zac Ross <zross@dancinggoats.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 8:51 AM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Natural Gas - Rate increase case

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Thursday, October 5, 2023 4:00 PM
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

Hello –

I'm new to this but wanted to reach out in response to the message I received from PSE about their requested rate increases for natural gas consumers.

What options/actions do you recommend to increase our chances of denying this request? Also, what information or context may I be missing that would bend my opinion of this requested price increase? I've recently become a homeowner and use Natural Gas for nearly all my appliances; I understand this is a convenience of modern times and it's supported by PSE though to say it benefits them feels like an understatement. Last year state regulators approved a multi-year rate plan (increase in rates) that increased their net revenue by \$293,600,000 at the beginning of this year and will again increase that by \$56,800,000 in January of next year. Transferring the cost of expansion to small businesses and homeowners, many of whom are already struggling to keep up with the increased cost of living, goods, and stagnant wages; seems like a chapter out of a book describing a boring dystopia and an unneeded pressure on our community.

From my perspective, this is a ridiculous request as it seems they are asking homeowners and small businesses to (partially?) fund their expansion. I understand there may be benefits to us with the expanded infrastructure but is that not the idea behind all consumed goods/experiences? An entity provides a service or product using equipment/spaces/assets that they purchase/create in exchange for money/resources from the consumer. If they can't do so in a sustainable way that allows them to generate more income than their expenses, than it's not a suitable business/service. If that tipping point is plausible but delayed, then is it not still their responsibility to pay for those changes and eat the cost until their return on the investment becomes profitable?

I'm sure there are levels to this that I'm not aware of and are affecting my opinions, but it felt inappropriate to not reach out, voice my opinion and hopefully better understand the situation I'm being confronted with.

Thank you for your time and efforts representing us and I hope you have a great day!

ZAC ROSS, IT Director
LOCATION: Corporate
Email: zross@dancinggoats.com | Phone: 800-955-5282



DANCING GOATS

OLYMPIA, WA | ATLANTA, GA | 1-800-955-5282

DANCINGGOATS.COM | [Sign Up to Receive our Newsletter](#)

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Lena Rudquist <rudquistl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 1:50 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: PSE rate raise request

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

I received the email sent to customers regarding proposed 3.5% rise in rates. I do not see why we all have to pay to recover the costs incurred for the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility through a new tariff schedule. Tacoma should pay for their own expenses. **I do NOT agree that this should be a permanent rate raise. If we have to pay to recover the cost, then it should collect that amount and then revert back to previous rate.**

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: Elizabeth Stoddert <lstoddert@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 12:45 PM
To: comments@utc.wa.gov
Cc: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-23093

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL]

My husband and I have been living here in Lacey since 1994. We have seen such growth that is staggering; with housing rates and power rates increasing exponentially.

PSE is a private company with share holders holding everybody captive to increasing wealth. I have heard that PSE is not owned in this country but by foreign entity which is also disgusting if that is the case.

In Europe senior citizens receive financial benefits to help with heating and lighting so they will be able to stay in their home. Not so here in the USA.

My fear is inevitable widowhood; not being able to pay my power and property tax bill living on social security and having to sell my house because I won't be able to sustain the high bills and won't be able to afford rental accommodations either because the rents are also too high.

I believe this is a dilemma for senior citizens that is only going to get worse as greedy companies and shareholders control the power and leave the middle income classes to foot the bill and pay their taxes.

Elizabeth M Stoddert

Hartman, Brice C (ATG)

From: melody young <shygirlmw1983@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 4:11 PM
To: ATG WWW E-mail Public Counsel
Subject: Docket UG-230393

[EXTERNAL]

As a resident of Thurston county I'm not paying more because of a project. The economy is bad enough and now you want to raise prices for gas use especially close to the winter time. I don't agree with this.

Sent from Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Docket UG-230393

Re Comments Schedule 141LNG-Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment

There are far too many reasons for my opposition as a customer, being asked to fund the Tacoma LNG facility. What PSE gains from this facility goes to them, not to me. I became sorry I wanted to cook on gas and got this to my home as I fixed it up to live in. After finding the gas blackened bricks on my fireplace up nearly to the ceiling, after natural gas powered "logs" were installed for extra heat, I wish I had never even considered natural gas in the first place. It's all been a very bad experience.

I was an original opponent of the Tacoma LNG Facility project from the beginning. I attended the packed public hearing that lasted an entire day. I was not able to hear the entire testimony but did definitely see the ones in favor could be counted on the fingers of one hand. These were mostly corporate people connected to the project and set to benefit financially. The public more than clearly indicated they did not believe this project was in the best interests for the long-term energy situation.

I had first understood that the gas would be going to China to manufacture plastics for the U.S. That story in a prominent news source was not repeated again. So PSE's story has now changed, it appears a large amount will be going for shipping fuel. This is a time when the shipping industry is changing to green energy. PSE seems to always be behind the way the world is going - is this intentional? Puget Sound customers are fed up with it.

Reasons why this facility should never have gone through to begin:

1) I am sincerely concerned about the future of my grandchildren and all the others who may likely continue the pattern of disease due to pollution that was not at this extent when I grew up. And, of course, this is far higher and more dangerous in communities that are exposed to greater amounts. It is difficult to live and work when a person is not healthy, along with the fact they are discriminated against as far as receiving help for a way to survive.

2) I am very angry that the Puyallup Tribe has lost more than they had in earlier days. The land they have now is mostly barely suitable for most uses and, with the infrastructure that was warned against prior to the passage of the GMA, then went in immediately afterwards, this land is littered with signs warning of routes out if the mountain goes. The tribe has been doing well with the casino, but now the entire area is changed - industrial ugly and uninviting, as well as a place where people think pollution when in the area. How much more can be done by corporations to totally destroy a civilization?

2) There have been extensive flaws in the process that allowed this facility to go ahead:

- As I mentioned above, the public overwhelmingly said NO. People do not turn out for any old thing, but this one was of great importance to stop, according to a very large number of people in the Tacoma-Federal Way-Seattle areas. Maybe corporations don't, but most people think long-term for the most important issues. Today, one of those 2 important issues is climate change.
- PSE went ahead before all permits were approved. What kind of privileges is this company allowed?
- In addition to that, the process involved only very weak agencies that granted the approvals - the Pollution Control Hearings Board and PSCAA had no consultation with other agencies at state level that should have been involved since the moves that PSE has made, and continues to make, are in direct opposition to the decisions that have been made by Washington Legislature on energy use. (This did not all happen recently and PSE likely knew

and went ahead anyway. I read that the Pollution Control Hearings Board did not even address any of the effects that WILL affect climate change. They failed to address the whole factual picture.)

I am ashamed that regulatory controls in Washington are so far behind in a process that started years and years ago.

3) I have little trust in PSE. I know their rates were higher in the '90's than 2 nearby public systems - Peninsula Light in Gig Harbor - and also PUD#3 in Mason County. I experienced service from both of these companies of high quality. I received service that helped my air circulation, heat savings, and actually, helped with a hole to the outside where a board was missing in one house. Years later, Peninsula Light stood by their policies and fixed it for me since it occurred during install of my furnace. In contrast, I call PSE for the services they say they provide, but end up with a young sassy employee who knows literally nothing. And, the services turn out not to be available after all. (This last time, I finally signed up for services at King County for my energy needs, but they are so overloaded, likely due to the needs that PSE does not fill, or care to fill, that the waiting list is so terribly long.)

In addition, I had no idea so much of the job of new gas installation was subsidized until I requested gas for a remodel about 9 years ago. After the installation, I got a knock on the door one day - a company associated with PSE was there to do tests to make sure the system was safe. I'm not sure if this is done with all new installs, but this got me thinking maybe it was the line they couldn't find when they went to install. It took a total of 3 solid work days to finally get to the line that was serving a neighbor. This neighbor had smaller diameter pipes than the new ones put on for my install. All together, I became very skeptical of the PSE work, not even doing maintenance adequately to know where their own lines exist. To top it off, they covered the 3rd or 4th of the holes dug in the street with a rounded berm, so I had to call to get them to fix this. They weren't going to do it, but I think a neighbor must have complained as well since they back out onto this area, and that seemed to get PSE to change their minds. I'm sorry I ever even thought natural gas, but plan to replace with all electric, soon as I can get funds to buy a new water heater and stove, and hopefully get my furnace to start on all electric.

Quality of work with PSE is a subject with lots of questions. All they seem to want is to install more and more to get natural gas locked in for years to come. Of course, this is precisely opposite of what should be happening now.

Living in rural Port Orchard, WA, I experienced extreme incompetence with PSE, in addition. We were without electricity, meaning wells not working for all in our area, for 2 solid weeks at one time. It took many years later for PSE to realize all they would have had to do was trim branches away from the lines. They were working on the electricity for a bridge that had gone down in this area and the lines got trimmed awhile afterwards. Maybe a neighbor pointed out the branches laying across lines, I don't know. But, obviously, no one from PSE had ever come in person to check the area while we experience outages on a regular basis for years. They spent all their time going to doors to make sure we all agreed on meters that self-reported - to lower their expenses, of course - actually the only thing we've ever seen from PSE after the company was privatized.

4) A big fact that I bet PSE understands very well, but doesn't want to talk about it: LNG is actually worse for climate change in the shorter term. It heats up at a far higher temperature than gas.* It is within this short term that we need to lower temperatures so they don't go over a threshold that will put more life at risk. Not being able to do this due to projects such as the Tacoma LNG Facility will definitely cause temperatures to rise, meaning increased death for many more vegetable and animal species, including humans. In sum, liquid natural gas will cause far more destruction than any good it could ever bring, within this 10- or so year period of its life in the atmosphere. The timing is all wrong, and the decision for allowing permits to build this plant were extremely flawed.

*This is not to say use gas instead since the length of time in the atmosphere is 10 times that of LNG. It means cut fossil fuels.

5) Another argument is the one about interim fuels. This is also faulty since there is no reason why more solar and wind cannot be deployed. Already the industry is becoming large and communities are benefiting. Why did this have to happen in the town where I was born? I am very upset and angry due to all the work many, including me, have done to save Puget Sound, especially the Tacoma Tideflats and the clean-up of slag out in the Sound years ago. For a century when we should know better, this is one of the worst examples I can imagine of being totally out of touch.

6) Address the dollar as the only measure is also a flawed argument. Regulatory agencies should have figured this one out, if they are truly working for the good of Washington. Think extra health costs due to toxic emissions, for one. The costs to the environment can't be totaled in dollars because they will go on for years to come. Think costs of fracking itself - the water required, the value of the land where fracking is done, destroyed for other uses such as food crops, or housing. When the water is bad, the land becomes useless. EPIC, Uof Chicago, focused on economics alone, even admits in a 2018 study on costs and benefits of fracking in a fracking community, for the average household, "...benefits...worth about \$2,000 per year." But, "If people's understanding of the health impacts were to change, it is likely this would alter the net benefits of allowing fracking." ("Fracking Has Its Costs and Benefits" Michael Greenstone, Forbes, 2/20/2018).

7) I could say many more things, but one thing that sticks in my mind about the attitudes and feeling that come out of PSE for customers was the way their employees appear to be brainwashed to actually believe natural gas is clean. I asked one day when the trucks were in the neighborhood after the fiasco trying to find the gas line described above, "Why do you use the words "Clean" and "Green" on your trucks?" The employees claimed it was clean and also made a few smart-a remarks. I did not appreciate the way I was addressed and their attitudes of superiority and putting customers down. I was asking an honest question and wanted to know what PSE was trying to project to both their employees and to their entire customer base. I always like to hear both sides. They actually didn't come up with any real facts that justified what they told me, however.

Obviously, beyond the fact I am not actually able to support more for my heat, mainly due to the fact that Social Security has never given actual cost of living increases - that is until right after Covid for the first time ever. Our costs are based on only the necessities and a new roof doesn't figure in that, for one simple example. That was a corporate new rule in more recent years. I keep thinking, why me to foot a cost of doing business? PSE will benefit from it, not me.

More important, although, is the fact that more natural gas will only keep us from being able to get a handle on temperatures rising. So, thanks to PSE, for one, we can continue to expect more fires, periods of extreme heat, along with pollution in the air. I am also angry about the Tacoma LNG Facility having been approved after customers spoke out against this project so clearly far before any moves were made.

Not relating to this, but costs to the customer do cause it to relate to the public impressions:

The Cap and Trade program developed by Washington Dept. of Ecology was a choice for corporations and is a program where the companies will eventually benefit in the long run. Why is PSE making it appear to be a "compliance instrument"? This was a corporate choice as far as I understood after having attending planning meetings at Ecology.

It would be so much better if PSE could operate on a truthful level with the public. If this had been presented before, rather than after the fact that we will be billed for it, I am certain, after seeing other similar choices, that customers would not object at all to putting money into what we need to do to keep temperatures from going higher, with electric, etc. I hope that PSE is able to cut itself off from the fossil fuel industry and behave like a normal utility by serving the public as they should be doing.

Thank you for the opportunity to say these things that fester in all of our minds on a regular basis.