

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments: 756**

**In Favor: 3**

**Opposed: 747**

**Undecided: 6**

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

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

## Public Comments by Case

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Paul Duke	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Paul Duke</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Elizabeth Burton	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. This is a bad idea, since LNG in many cases has a higher greenhouse gas footprint than conventional maritime fuels, when emissions are counted on a well-to-wake basis, as they should be.</p> <p>PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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, and health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>
--	------------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. This project should not have been built: to meet climate targets, it will need to be retired long before it is paid off. The public should not be saddled with paying off this stranded asset. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Elizabeth Burton</p>
--	--	--	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rev. Kristy Daniels	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Kristy Daniels</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Oneida Arnold	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Oneida Arnold</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Caroline Swinehart	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------------	--------	--



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Caroline Swinehart</p>
	Scott Patterson	E-mail	<p>To: the Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Re: Puget Sound Energy Request for a Rate Increase</p> <p>I implore you to not grant a rate increase to Puget Sound Energy for the following reasons:</p> <p>PSE is already Washington's most expensive energy provider, and is so because it is a for-profit company that has pursued large infrastructure projects that maximize profits for its investors rather than committing to the most economical and carbon-free sources of energy for its ratepayers. These large carbon-intensive infrastructure projects, many of which have been vigorously opposed by PSE ratepayers, have not shown to make measurable improvements in reliability metrics or the daily lives of PSE customers.</p> <p>Energy is essential to daily life, and is therefore an inescapable expense for ratepayers, many of which are already struggling to make ends meet with continued inflation. Putting the financial burden on rate payers for PSE's need to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility makes no sense when the facility was not built for their benefit. Residential customers who would only use approximately 2% of the use of the facility, are being asked to pay for 43% of the construction costs. Its main purpose is for marine fuel.</p> <p>Additionally, PSE does not deserve a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility which has been controversial from its inception for a number of reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It includes an 8 million gallon storage tank that was initially built without permit on unstable land fill in an earthquake zone adjacent to downtown Tacoma and the Puyallup Tribal land.</li><li>• It presents an immediate environmental degradation that impacts the daily life of the Puyallup Tribe which has led them and Earthjustice to pursue a long legal battle contesting the issuing of a permit to PSE for the Tacoma LNG facility.</li></ul>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- The immigrants living in the NW Detention Center are also currently exposed to extensive pollution from the LNG facility.
- The LNG facility also exposes about 100,000 residents of Tacoma to potential jeopardy as they reside in the blast zone of the 8 million gallon tank were it to explode. Given its location in the earthquake zone on unstable landfill (as stated by geologists) this makes a potential explosion sufficiently feasible that a permit should never have been issued. It is inconceivable to understand what rationale of either PSE executives or the permitting body was used to even consider permitting and building an LNG facility in such a location?

Furthermore, PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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.

Finally, the Utilities & Transportation Commission should stop approving rate increases that force customers to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure. The Utilities and Transportation Commission looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. PSE infrastructure has created the highest rates in Washington. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations. Please consider the following:

- 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. Methane is a greenhouse gas that is 84x more heating in the atmosphere than CO2. Scientists have overwhelmingly stated that reduction of methane emissions is crucial to limiting global warming to internationally established targets because of its potent warming effect.
- 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

• Customers would pay off the massive costs of fossil fuel infrastructure projects over many decades. To meet Washington’s climate targets, new fossil fuel projects will need to be retired well before they are paid off—potentially leaving customers on the hook for huge costs that they never benefit from.

In summary, please reject Puget Sound Energy's request for a rate increase.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Patterson

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Catherine NANCY Reid-McKee	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Catherine NANCY Reid-McKee</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756

**In Favor:** 3

**Opposed:** 747

**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Stacey Romero	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. STOP REWARDING UTILITIES FOR EXPANDING FOSSIL FUEL UTILIZATION. Stacey Romero

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dee Bar	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Dee Bar</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	MICHAEL LAFRENIERE	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Why should residential customers have to subsidize the cost of a filling station for cargo ships?  Socializing the costs of production = Welfare for corporations! Let them pay for it!  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should NOT receive ANY residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  MICHAEL LAFRENIERE</p>
	Wendy Krakauer	E-mail	<p>The UTC needs to deny PSE’s requested rate increase for recovering costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Refinery.</p> <p>The Puyallup Tribe and Earth Justice are still appealing in court the permits for this controversial facility.</p> <p>Residential customers such as myself, a retiree on a fixed income, should not have to pay for a facility mainly used to supply maritime fuel.</p> <p>We are in a climate crisis and should not be forced to continue reimbursing utilities that build fossil fuel infrastructure.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to do the right thing in denying PSE’s requested rate increase.</p> <p>Wendy Krakauer</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	George Burazer	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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.” To move in the direction of cleaner energy sources, I believe any additional funds or funding increases should go to renewables. Building infrastructure for fracked gas delivery goes counter to the long term goals to address the chaos of climate change. PSE 's Tacoma LNG plans to cover costs need to be shelved.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. George Burazer</p>
--	----------------	--------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. SHARON Cox	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Climate change is real and driven by fossil fuel usage.</p> <p>We must end our use of fossil fuels if we want to save this beautiful planet that God created!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. SHARON Cox</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	MICHAEL LAFRENIERE	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  MICHAEL LAFRENIERE</p>
	Melinda Roberts	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  
The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Melinda Roberts

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 spiritual being of love and light, 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." For the PNW, Mother Earth, for all of humanity!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Shelly Ackerman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Connie Clark	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Connie Clark</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kendra Wagner	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Kendra Wagner</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Jared Howe	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Ms Eleana Pawl	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 who also pays attention to science and what is going on with the climate, 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>Moving forward with LNG is such a dangerous and costly mistake. If you don't see that, your grandchildren will.</p> <p>PLEASE, have the courage to step and REALLY do the right thing. We are counting on you to see the bigger picture beyond the short-term taking of profits. The future of our region depends on the scope of your vision. Going ahead with LNG and spending further time in the courts muscling through a bad decision is just a waste of time and money and our resources.</p> <p>I believe you can do better and will keep on praying that you do.</p> <p>--Eleana Pawl Seattle, WA</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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</p>
--	----------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 Eleana Pawl</p>
	Bobby Righi	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>Do not allow Puget Sound Energy to raise rates for their customers. They have spent foolishly on projects that maximize profits but do nothing to help serve their customers. Large projects like the Tacoma LNG refinery are not a prudent investment for ratepayers. This project, like many of PSE’s past projects, has been vigorously opposed by PSE’s customers and is manifestly harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Raising rates forces customers to pay off the massive costs of fossil fuel infrastructure projects over many decades. To meet Washington’s climate targets, new fossil fuel projects will need to be retired well before they are paid off—potentially leaving customers on the hook for huge costs that they never benefit from.</p> <p>Please deny this rate hike request.</p> <p>Bobby Righi, a Puget Sound Energy Customer</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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." Locking us into years of continued fossil fuel usage is extremely counterproductive.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Dorothy Jordan</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Amy Faith	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	-----------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Amy Faith</p>
	Pat Montgomery	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 forwards, not backwards, in our movement to reduce carbon emissions and climate change.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Pat Montgomery</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Marc Smason	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>just because pse values profit above humanity's survival, i can't in good conscience, contribute 2 our demise with my meager funds.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Marc Smason</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Susan 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Susan MacGregor</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Mrs. Barbara Gregg	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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." PSE has kept the project afloat somewhat keeping customers unaware of the involvement to provide funding of the plant. My awareness was due to the location and the fact that construction continued despite the various challenges regarding permits, environmental impacts and working with the TOTE shipping company. As to that I also think the Port of Tacoma therefore City of Tacoma are accomplices in the project.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Barbara Gregg</p>
--	--------------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Daniel Serres	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	---------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Daniel Serres</p>
--	--	--	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Linda Zaugg	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Linda Zaugg</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rev 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Victoria Poling</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Jim Bernthal	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I'm a gas customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), and I firmly oppose any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. Here are my reasons for my opposition to this rate increase (shared by all PSE gas customers I've talked with):</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	--------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Jim Bernthal</p>
	Ms. Jean Waight	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 think it is vital to have and build right relationships with Native Americans. They teach the rest of us a lot about so many things, and the rest of us need to uphold their righteous rights. And 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 also studied PSE as part of a WSU program for climate volunteers, "Carbon Masters" and took away that PSE is capable of moving off fossil fuels sooner rather than later.</p> <p>Support organizations who are helping us reduce our energy needs. I do my part, driving an EV, keeping my house at 66 degrees in daytime, hanging laundry to dry, and many other steps.</p> <p>Jean Waight</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. Jean Waight</p>
	Adina Parsley	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Adina Parsley</p>
	<p>Rev. Susanna Griefen</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 or expanded 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>The pipeline a violation of treaty rights. As a person of faith, I think we should love our neighbors and keep our word. Do treaties mean nothing to PSE and to the government?</p> <p>Fracking is a water hog, a typical well uses four million gallons of water. In times when we are asked to conserve water, why are we being asked to pay for a pipeline that depletes our water, is not producing gas for WA residents, and contributes to global warming.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure and increased profits for PSE’s shareholders. Forcing customers</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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,  
Rev. Susanna Griefen

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Pamela Rains	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Pamela Rains</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kathleen Konieczka	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Konieczka</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Judith Schwab	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Judith Schwab</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Alison Roxby	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 are in a climate crisis and continued investment in fossil fuels is a poor business strategy. Ratepayers should not fund this project especially as they will not benefit.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Alison Roxby</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Teri Wiseman-Kuhlman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Further, I do not understand why PSE began - and continues - to push for the building of this facility immediately after citizens and the Puyallup Tribe were resounding in their action to NOT have a methanol plant situated in the Tideflats. It felt underhanded. I know they are different types of plants, but the issue is management of natural resources and a cleaner environment. THAT is where the money/resources need to be directed.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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, Teri Wiseman-Kuhlman</p>
--	----------------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Ms. 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 or expanded 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.</p> <p>We should be going in the direction of using fewer fossil fuels, not more. In addition, the process of fracking is very harmful to the environment, as is the continued pollution of the air from burning carbon fuels. 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>For these reasons, I strongly oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure, including the Tacoma LNG facility.</p> <p>Sincerely, Marian Schwartz</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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>
--	---------------------	--------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Sincerely, Ms. Marian Schwartz
--	--	--	-----------------------------------

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jennifer Keller	E-mail	<p>These comments are for Docket UG-230393.</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.</p> <p>Please deny PSE's requests to pass along to ratepayers the costs of the Tacoma LNG Facility. This project is unnecessary, damaging, expensive, and poorly conceived, and does not benefit ratepayers. PSE has gone ahead with it even without all the necessary permits or public process, and has assumed they can push the project through and then force ratepayers to pay for it. This is unacceptable, and encourages other companies to try the same tactics.</p> <p>Here are some of the reasons that this rate increase should be denied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The facility provides almost no benefit to ratepayers. PSE reports that only 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>• 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 main purpose of the facility is to provide LNG to marine vessels, not benefit ratepayers. This is also clearly unfair. Ratepayers should not be forced to pay for a fueling facility for marine ships.</li> <li>• 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 Tidelands 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?</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>I urge you to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard. Ratepayers should not have to pay for this unnecessary, expensive, harmful, and poorly conceived project.</p> <p>Thank you.  Jennifer Keller</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Felicity Devlin	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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. Tacomans did not want the LNG plant, but PSE proceeded anyway. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live up to 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 or expanded 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,  Felicity Devlin</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Scott Bishop	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Scott Bishop</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nancy Vandenberg	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 faith guides me to care for the world and all that is in it. We can't do that with increased fracking. We need to move away from fossil fuels. This fossil fuel infrastructure does not benefit the community, and PSE should not be raising rates so customers will have to pay for it. Please STOP with the new fossil fuel infrastructure, which will bring further damage to the earth and its inhabitants.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Nancy Vandenberg</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Stephanie Bell</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Shary B</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jennifer Hiebert	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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--but let me be clear: we will do this over a precipice when we hit planetary boundaries, or we will do it more gradually, with the welfare of all of us in mind, starting now. We don't have a choice to continue to use fossil fuels without disastrous consequences. 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," and to do what makes sense, in the larger view.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Jennifer Hiebert</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Mr. 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 or expanded 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>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 or expanded 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>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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>
--	--------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Mr. Thomas Gilmore
	linda conroy	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 I have a moral obligation to 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 or expanded 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, linda conroy</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Katherine Jesser	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, and in Tacoma, I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Fracked NG releases releases much more methane, the the most powerful GHG there is. Tacoma should not be allowing there too be a wider world wide market for NG from our port.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Katherine Jesser</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Danielle Rowland	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Danielle Rowland</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Frank Handler	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Please, NO!!!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,          Frank Handler</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rev. 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 or expanded 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 member of the clergy, 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." Both the church and my own home are part of PSE service area and as a church we are committed to climate justice a better way forward for current and future generations.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Amy Hitchens</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Kristin Edmark	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Utility rate payers should not be forced to pay for a project which encourages fossil fuel production and infrastructure at a time we must be decreasing fossil fuel use. Methane/fossil gas is an extremely potent green-house gas which is so small that it leaks from drilling to end use. Substituting one fossil fuel for another is not the answer. Both destroy our climate. Fossil-free ships are being built by B9 shipping, Large shipping companies have pledged to be carbon neutral. The market cannot correct as clean energy outpaces fossil fuels if we keep subsidizing fossil fuel use. PSE should not have built Tacoma LNG. Washingtonians do not want it and certainly do not want to subsidize it.</p> <p>Washington State should be a climate leader. Rate payers subsidizing methane/fossil gas gas use is in direct opposition to Washington state climate legislation and Washington state climate goals. Some people thought that substituting methane/fossil gas for coal was the answer for utility companies. We now know it is not. Likewise, some people think that substituting methane/fossil gas for diesel is the answer for shipping. It is not. We need to phase out fossil fuel production which is costing lives, disaster relief, water supplies, extinctions and so much more.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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>
--	----------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<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. Kristin Edmark</p>
Rev Ruth Marston-Bihl	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 someone who grew up in Tacoma, I know that the additional costs would have been a burden to my family. I’m dismayed that a utility that our society is dependent on would pass the burden of a corporate interest onto local customers.</p> <p>As someone who grew up in Tacoma and didn’t get her driver’s license until her mid-twenties as a protest against partaking in the fossil-fuel economy, I am horrified to know that my unavoidable energy bill would have contributed to the creation of a fossil-fuel project that would continue to add to the harm of our planet.</p> <p>As someone who supports the Puyallup Tribe, I am dismayed that we are again fighting a chemical and greenhouse hazard on their sovereign land.</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>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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 Ruth Marston-Bihl</p>
	de goldsmith	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>This is a flawed and manipulative request. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should NOT receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
de goldsmith

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nelda Swiggett	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Nelda Swiggett</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Victoria Summerquist	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 grew up in Tacoma and remember how polluted it was. We need to move onto green energy. 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 or expanded 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,  Victoria Summerquist</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. 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 or expanded 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>Please, 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." ...for planet and our kids!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Mark Tanis</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Elizabeth Blakney	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Elizabeth Blakney</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Mr. 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 or expanded 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>PSE's LNG program is ABSOLUTELY HORRIBLE to the CLIMATE!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>It is CRUEL to the PUYALLUP NATION too!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>WUTC must PROTECT RATE-PAYERS FROM BEING ABUSED by PSE!!!!!!!!!!!!</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 or expanded 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. Glen Anderson</p>
--	-------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Warren Kronenberg	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Warren Kronenberg</p>
--	-------------------	--------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dr. Stephanie Sarver	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Stephanie Sarver</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Marcia and Gary Lagerloef	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Marcia and Gary Lagerloef</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Denis Langhans	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Denis Langhans</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments: 756**

**In Favor: 3**

**Opposed: 747**

**Undecided: 6**

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Peggy J. Printz	E-mail	<p>Dear Commission Members,</p> <p>Please vote “NO” to the facility’s permit, It should not continue construction or operation until a legitimate review is conducted that honors the Puyallup Tribe’s legal rights to consultation, evaluates the many changes to the project, and fairly weighs the science of methane leaks from fracked gas infrastructure.</p> <p>As you know, methane is 83 times worse for the planet than CO2 emissions!</p> <p>Thank you, Peggy J, Printz</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Polly Taylor	E-mail	<p>I am writing to provide comments regarding the request by Puget Sound Energy's liquified natural gas rate adjustment. This email will serve as my public comment on this request.</p> <p>I understand that the 3.51% requested increase for residential customers to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) has been made in order to "recover the costs incurred for the development, construction and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility through this new tariff schedule".</p> <p>Why should residential customers bear the burden of building infrastructure for PSE? Shouldn't the development, construction and operation of this facility be paid for by the company itself, rather than customers? Do other profit-making companies ask their customers to cover the costs of development for future projects? I assume that creation of this facility will enhance PSE's ability to increase production and their profits. Commercial and industrial customers have been assessed a 3.46% increase. Why the difference?</p> <p>Reading the request from PSE, I am concerned that the proposed 3.51% increase for residential customers is based on a questionable rationale and that residential customers should not be obligated to provide infrastructure enhancements for PSE. I would appreciate more information regarding the rate increases that the UTC has approved in the last five years. My natural gas bill seems to increase regularly, even with energy saving measures.</p> <p>A final request: Please provide the reasons that the UTC did not approve this rate increase on June 8, 2023. I note that "...the UTC issued Order 01 Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions" and scheduled a public hearing.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Polly Taylor</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Marianne McNabb	E-mail	<p>We are writing to provide comments regarding the request by Puget Sound Energy's liquified natural gas rate adjustment. This email will serve as our public comment on this request.</p> <p>We understand that the 3.51% requested increase for residential customers to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) has been made in order to "recover the costs incurred for the development, construction and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility through this new tariff schedule".</p> <p>We are mystified by this request. Why should residential customers bear the burden of building infrastructure for PSE? Shouldn't the development, construction and operation of this facility be paid for by the company itself, rather than customers? Do other profit-making companies ask their customers to cover the costs of development for future projects? We assume that creation of this facility will enhance PSE's ability to increase production and their profits. We also note that commercial and industrial customers have been assessed a 3.46% increase. Why the difference?</p> <p>Reading the request from PSE, we are concerned that the proposed 3.51% increase for residential customers is based on a questionable rationale and that residential customers should not be obligated to provide infrastructure enhancements for PSE. We would appreciate more information regarding the rate increases that the UTC has approved in the last five years. Our natural gas bill seems to increase regularly, even with energy saving measures.</p> <p>A final request: Please provide the reasons that the UTC did not approve this rate increase on June 8, 2023. We note that "...the UTC issued Order 01 Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions" and scheduled a public hearing.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Marianne McNabb</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Norm Haynes	E-mail	<p>Please clarify where I am wrong?!</p> <p>* what does "Tacoma LNG Facility" mean??????</p> <p>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 &amp; Consumers?????????</p> <p>WHICH WAY IS THE LNG GOING IN OTHER WORDS?</p> <p>* 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?</p> <p>* 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.</p> <p>* WHAT IS PSE's "STANCE" on GOV working against them ??? PSE has NEVER answered me on that.</p> <p>* SO - WHY THE F do every day consumers need to help build a ginourmous TACOMA transfer facility????????????????????</p> <p>* SEATTLE GOV has already made it ILEAGAL to install Natural Gas Meters for NEW CONSTRUCTION of HOUSES ETC.</p> <p>* BRANDON is HELL BENT on increasing the cost of ALL APPLIANCES while at the same time makeing them last LESS LONG. WORK CRAPIER.</p> <p>****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.</p> <p>* So GOV is working against PSE's mission which I assume is to sell MORE natural GAS at as</p>
--	-------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>High A Price as Possible - NO?</p> <p>*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.</p> <p>BRANDON CANCELING PIPELINES &amp; PROJECTS AND NOT ALLOWING ANY NEW SOURCES OF FUEL EXCEPT FOR COAL POWERED ELECTRIC PLANTS - PREFERRABLY IN CHINA</p> <p>*** SERIOUSLY WHAT THE FUCK ARE "WE" DOING!***</p> <p>Sincerely, Norm Haynes - paying PSE since 1994. PSE CUSTOMER # 200006488874 15816 - 34 AVE NE LK FOR PARK WA 98155</p> <p>**** THANKS FOR NOTHING -- nothing ANY OF YOU DO MAKES ANY GD SENSE.</p>	
	Karl Dehm	E-mail	<p>you are seriously entertaining the idea of upping your rates for a product that this administration is trying to ban. they want to put all petroleum products out of business. empower the electrical companies and force their agenda on all of us.</p> <p>in a time where we are fighting against this you want to up the only alternative to their agenda, which includes your extinction.</p> <p>you may want to consider the present economy, the fact that this administration wants to ban the use of appliances that run on your product, your product, etc. before alienating the very folks that keep you in business.</p> <p>karl dehm everett, washington</p> <p>This email is intended for the recipient listed on the to line, above. It is not for sale, resale/release to any other entity without my express permission, regardless of your company data policy.</p>
	David M Friscia	E-mail	RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy - Docket UG-230393 Rate Filing for Tacoma LNG



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

### Facility Recovery Costs

While I do not support this project in any capacity, if PSCAA decides to approve this permit, I request the new emissions that will result from this facility's operation be fully mitigated. I recommend PSCAA incorporate the following mitigation requirements into PSE's NOC permit, if approved: Within one year of startup, PSE should be required to;

- 1) Catalog the sources of vented and flared methane locally and regionally.
- 2) Develop an action plan for how they will capture all of these emissions.
- 3) Develop a progressive work plan for how they will incorporate emerging technologies into their system so that within 10 years from startup, the Tacoma LNG facility and associated end-use applications will be run solely on local/regional sources of renewable, sustainable energy

I further recommend PSCAA incorporate interim mitigation measures into PSE's permit while PSE is developing the plans described above. Interim mitigation activities can include: carbon capture and sequestration; carbon capture and reinsertion to the grid; biogas capture and sequestration; biogas capture and reinsertion to the grid, and; local reforestation.

Given that one of the stated purposes of this project is to reduce emissions harmful to public health, I request PSCAA be more transparent about the analyzed pollutants by highlighting all emissions calculations – especially those showing no decrease in particulate matter close to shore – not just PSCAA's purported reduction in GHGs. Further, CHB recommends PSCAA include particulate matter mitigation requirements in PSE's permit, if approved.

The NOC worksheet states, "...there is substantial evidence showing that arsenic and mercury is present in natural gas in quantifiable amounts." Additionally, PSCAA's modeling showed that "...formaldehyde, benzene, toluene, naphthalene, phenanthrene, 2-methylnaphthalene and fluorene were detected at levels greater than the field blank." The impacts of these toxic air pollutants should be mitigated to protect public health. How will PSE be required to mitigate for these additional toxic emissions?

The NOC worksheet concludes that the Tacoma LNG facility will not be subject to many federal regulations, including subparts of New Source Performance Standards ([NSPS]40 CFR part 60). The worksheet claims that because the Tacoma LNG project is "not a natural gas processing facility" subparts LLL and KKK of NSPS do not apply. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Safety Administration defines a natural gas processing facility as “a facility designed to ‘clean’ raw natural gas by separating impurities and various non-methane hydrocarbons and fluids...” 14 Section 2-3 of the FSEIS entitled, “LNG Processing Facility” shows that the methane gas entering the Tacoma LNG facility will undergo both amine pretreatment and non-methane hydrocarbon removal. I request PSCAA provide clarification on why the Tacoma LNG facility is not a natural gas processing facility and therefore not subject to these subparts of the NSPS.

The NOC worksheet goes on to state, “The Tacoma LNG project will only be fueling vessels, not filling tank ships or tank barges that transport LNG,” and the “PSE Tacoma LNG is not engaged in marine tank vessel loading operations...” and is therefore not subject to regulation under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ([NESHAP] 40 CFR part 63). However, the FSEIS states, “LNG may also be supplied to bunker vessels for subsequent transfer to ships,” with over 55% of the total LNG produced slated for use by “Other Marine (by bunker barge).” We are particularly concerned about the lack of clarity around bunkering operations for the proposed action. The FSEIS, NOC and Order of Approval all contain conflicting language making it entirely unclear how LNG bunkering will occur. CHB requests PSCAA obtain confirmation regarding bunkering operations, as well as provide further justification why the Tacoma LNG facility is not subject to NESHA. Given that PSCAA is tasked with protecting human and environmental health, this dangerous ambiguity around bunkering operations is in scope for PSCAA’s analysis and should be reason enough for PSCAA to deny this permit.

In their response to comments on the draft SEIS, PSCAA stated, “the FEIS does not show the proposed plant to be located on Puyallup Tribal lands or Future Tribal Lands.” The Tacoma LNG facility is not just an LNG storage tank. As part of this project and as described in the FEIS, a new pipeline was constructed - which will have emissions regulated by PSCAA - and sits inside the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Reservation lands as well as the 1873 Survey Area, which is used as the basis for government-to-government consultation in the Puyallup Land Claims Settlement Act of 1989.16 Additionally, the LNG tank itself sits on man-made fill, which covers the lands which the Puyallup Tribe and other Coast Salish peoples have used for hunting, fishing, and ceremonial practices since Time Immemorial. I request PSCAA update their project documentation to reflect these facts about the lands of the Puyallup Tribe.

Sincerely,  
David M Friscia

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	s Jacky	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>
--	---------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>I urge the UTC to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>s Jacky</p>
	<p>Dan Casey</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Dan Casey</p>
	Anne Kroeker	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>In fact, PSE should not have any support for building out any fossil fuel infrastructure. But they will continue to make these choices, as long as they only have to look to their captive customers to recover the costs. And if they do not sell this fuel for maritime use, as originally planned which is not without its grave dangers, they will try to sell it to the global market, exacerbating our already</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>too-stressed increasing GHG environment. At the very least, the people who will not have any benefit from this fuel source, and on the contrary, bear all the environmental harm, should not also have to pay for it.</p> <p>Bill McKibbin reports that the current growth of the US LNG build-out, is enormous and game over for the planet. <a href="https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/a-smoking-gun-for-bidens-big-climate-decision">https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/a-smoking-gun-for-bidens-big-climate-decision</a>. While it is not the UTC's purview to keep PSE, or any utility, from building any infrastructure, they certainly do not have to endorse this ongoing effort and certainly not at the expense of the people who have no utility choice. And in giving the greenlight to PSE to charge for this LNG plant, it also rings the planetary death knoll for not only these same customers, but for everyone.</p> <p>The days of investment in fossil fuel energies is fast diminishing with even lower payouts than for renewable energy sources. It will not be long before the pension funds who invest in these utilities, turn around, and pull out, if cleaner sources are not employed. In fact, the Washington State Investment Board (WSIB) is already receiving pressure from its members to get out of the gas industry. When that happens with the PSE pension fund investors, it will be certain that PSE will turn to their customers again, to bail them out, especially if they were successful previously in this effort.</p> <p>Please do not allow this requested rate increase for Puget Sound Energy and help Washington State continue its progress in being a climate leader.</p> <p>Thank you.  Anne Kroeker and Richard Leeds</p>
	Yvonne McCarty	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          Yvonne McCarty</p>
	<p>marcy williams</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>marcy williams</p>
	Julia Buck	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in NW Detention Center. It will also negatively impact the Tacoma tide flats, an ecologically important area connecting dozens of waterways that are used by fish, wildlife, and people. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is primarily a private gas company owned by foreign investors, not a utility, and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Julia Buck</p>
	Carol Kindt	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Carol Kindt</p>
	<p>John Bito</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>John Bito</p>
	M B	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>This dangerous bomb should never have been built within ten miles of residential areas.</p> <p>It should be shut down immediately and PSE executives should prosecuted for willfully endangering tens of thousands of Tacoma citizens.</p> <p>M B</p>
	Rosemary Moore	E-mail	<p>Good afternoon,</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

It is not clear to me whether my earlier email is being regarded as a written comment. For the avoidance of doubt, as a PSE gas and electric customer, I submit the following in opposition to PSE's requested rate increase.

1. We customers are already struggling to pay our bills & should not have to pay for PSE's poor investment choices. PSE wants to raise residential gas rates by 3.45%. This is unacceptable when PSE is already Washington's most expensive utility and many customers are struggling or unable to pay their bills. PSE has pursued large infrastructure projects that maximize profits for its investors, but these have not been shown to make measurable improvements in reliability metrics or the daily lives of PSE customers. Moreover, they do not help our move away from fossil fuels. PSE has not proven that large projects like the Tacoma LNG refinery are a prudent investment for ratepayers. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.

2. PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility for several reasons:

\* The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court.

\* 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

<[https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2Fc511-KAjM3jU\\_4OIFtitbWz-CvpCtEEJlzCwGQvOBbF2rr0ckrW-M5cB22hZ86wnzYLQloG-cAXY43XZ76JhorrQQKxzeBkjGmQ5J0nBsIm\\_GGZAVKDhrNJAKqzu1WBNiouU-IpkZi2K2RipEBNJuQaTtBSL4FbZyC\\_Q9x1SapERvdBEgRMm3xk03K5MMb8CKKjGwi3YJHgs5OWVvkqUGhf1jRViYqeFMbfQz28GPM0NodBxguylvld5RoVjP1\\_UbDE-VWAuTdNUcAOuOIGRs5DFNqrTnVua68MoR-BouiXjDP6ggWK6a9vI\\_VS6RHKO6eWLXHQT4mqFNwmswmmuq183esPosnlJB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2Fc511-KAjM3jU_4OIFtitbWz-CvpCtEEJlzCwGQvOBbF2rr0ckrW-M5cB22hZ86wnzYLQloG-cAXY43XZ76JhorrQQKxzeBkjGmQ5J0nBsIm_GGZAVKDhrNJAKqzu1WBNiouU-IpkZi2K2RipEBNJuQaTtBSL4FbZyC_Q9x1SapERvdBEgRMm3xk03K5MMb8CKKjGwi3YJHgs5OWVvkqUGhf1jRViYqeFMbfQz28GPM0NodBxguylvld5RoVjP1_UbDE-VWAuTdNUcAOuOIGRs5DFNqrTnVua68MoR-BouiXjDP6ggWK6a9vI_VS6RHKO6eWLXHQT4mqFNwmswmmuq183esPosnlJB-)

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

rOjNH\_Dyv-445aZNguFh4eGvZqmXK62X7micaLVbP9qj1VCZOdURzrhMLoiZIQXWd00  
CtODLd0hGSIZrztTj7-jWibwuxMKyCoWUjF\_3S8sVxH-  
JUVPIqcpXVnohpMPUFxzlj78HVSg2xk4kl1jgvdDFR-  
zfZ%2F40w%2F\_iAgS04NTiaUJOoc\_RkOtQ%2Fh4%2FGtU\_BsF2bnK5nLbM1xuZSVj2Z2I645  
kKkC\_FYQuH4vM&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df  
508dbda6b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C  
638343926935879355%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV  
2luMzIiLCJBTiI6I6k1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=S1%2  
BxXOKGw8McIqmQ4IYWZYP7VsqqWRCIDnDu2X%2FZX%2B4%3D&reserved=0> .  
\* 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.  
\* Moreover, even if LNG was cleaner, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be  
borne by residential customers. Residential customers would only use approximately 2% of the use  
of the facility, yet are being asked to pay for 43% of the construction costs.  
\* This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that 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.  
\* Additional Background Info on Tacoma LNG: Native Daily Network's Coverage of Tacoma  
LNG Resistance <[11/22/2023 11:54 AM](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2Fc511-KAjM3jU_4OIFtitbcoEI3kc0IBbAeD4Zd9M4ZUFWPYSKmjrmypY3GahNIpgCZ_A5SD9O5YsQQXZtT4vY8KsOUZerUkK05E0q4z8trE59gw9LHNbiHd6W4cajZsyOa92_D02p_xJWERupSHeRRk3UEy0boXcZITX7nx8oHkmObP00jyfPpqO7WnkAtEBJeTmwe-LRA0PjtzsKK35i0-8QUeRoaArfYboFCDoMKNIItFqTIHEQi9C-IVQRapdJ7lrVHKiS89s61AyRIZ1ea8s9qYNXoeYdkChumMmCEgGbbVx_LP9I9TMcjKbCHEPPmMMtI_h9qHDVLTz0VqmCi6q_GBcronKYe04eO-KyX9I3ndNPR478SL8aCzIt5KKhSPwKiM-7rIFUJJ1dtGff1w%2F40w%2F_iAgS04NTiaUJOoc_RkOtQ%2Fh5%2FbKfK0adagQA2NNt7FJ4h6hyjFqnBN8PvI9-tDkh8FQw&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df508dbda6b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343926935879355%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6I6k1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=HXyFLDM94Fzi9H1Y6blkGg%2</a>><br/>url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2Fc511-<br/>KAjM3jU_4OIFtitbcoEI3kc0IBbAeD4Zd9M4ZUFWPYSKmjrmypY3GahNIpgCZ_A5SD9O5<br/>YsQQXZtT4vY8KsOUZerUkK05E0q4z8trE59gw9LHNbiHd6W4cajZsyOa92_D02<br/>p_xJWERupSHeRRk3UEy0boXcZITX7nx8oHkmObP00jyfPpqO7WnkAtEBJeTmwe-<br/>LRA0PjtzsKK35i0-8QUeRoaArfYboFCDoMKNIItFqTIHEQi9C-<br/>IVQRapdJ7lrVHKiS89s61AyRIZ1ea8s9qYNXoeYdkChumMmCEgGbbVx_LP9I9<br/>TMcjKbCHEPPmMMtI_h9qHDVLTz0VqmCi6q_GBcronKYe04eO-<br/>KyX9I3ndNPR478SL8aCzIt5KKhSPwKiM-7rIFUJJ1dtGff1w%2F40w%2F_iAgS04<br/>NTiaUJOoc_RkOtQ%2Fh5%2FbKfK0adagQA2NNt7FJ4h6hyjFqnBN8PvI9-<br/>tDkh8FQw&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df508dbda6<br/>b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343926935879355%7<br/>CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6I6k1<br/>haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=HXyFLDM94Fzi9H1Y6blkGg%2</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

BRzFLj73r1f34a6s3W7w8%3D&reserved=0>

3. The Utilities & Transportation Commission should stop approving rate increases that force customers to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure.

\* PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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.

\* 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.

\* When PSE wants to build more gas infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane emissions <[https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2FafcYNHk4Eh2YdGnwBh-YDL2pqlARv2wBshrgOqWkXMH0fPmm8G2j0d_kDWQIHRYrC4piXyv_Vm-LBSFsBHIESSHJ6oy0B5eQgdH_7hNg9zM_tGYqugRhm1s83yWIO6iCLqqIQ-d1VHdpHxolp_SGW2TjhLcLgKldLD11UWRf8IPFrV2-uuKVwZ9EsdNq2jough8RPWQVvBI5UzAeewXja_L1gnSz3le3-xrWvgXQE30BXMouf-ak83UH8tYaEcd7kjnNznIt8R2FYGZOW1yQ72x2U_8jMaRsIOTYvxTuNC4VsAoW15_IYSjNPLa2BQRYulV7Ml4W1VoYpV9Dp3g0UeishuGzEwIUTnUybFv7oLNy781lyWG5gB4QztZY8ezk4w1zGBLEQMAN9nz8rZDj39ZD_aojtD4leNWuB5Hrb7fOLvp2_R4cxbzeVfi1UZh4Z1U0jX5Agqs_MdqSR1qQDvwNJ1aEaSkZWGUZ5uQSid8%2F40w%2F_iAgS04NTiaUJOoc_RkOtQ%2Fh6%2F6h-DX_f2Wu0xKpmk2KE0i7-C5dtqm8iz9JFyNYrx9sU&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df508dbda6b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343926935879355%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ikk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=Y1haX%2B5HPfYkmShwe9xQd7VYsrGHkHMetPMXNT9mCsA%3D&reserved=0> 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 <<a href=)



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2FMqag7sW8TIW-nixyBdulQooR6GVLtBHWpDZ6etJifl0zFIlsaUomb2LV04HgVqGsJLpmpfADaWL9mUCqMdg0LKfoHYE4b5BP6vmpUGQi1WWQI-S\_ONmSB19ouOetfK2ADXck\_PWttqQVNSWsSVWw19t24R\_5wGVil9w-C7RBO4jRvHUBrBxDQo\_76xlfjhafbX38Va4319F2riNZrq\_s-Q6iIS1eWWT\_CIA7JRHyee30e0fvySaYe59ks78nhHCulTXM17W8e4DTqM8wKQZc4IRNFcN-V0xQtpVfbaeuVYRCqqDL9Ya9SeE-Y26QFEFpm5jjdIr-fXPpsTD7\_EP9bPDngLQE2BuFenCbk-OJ95r\_\_NBS4B6GschPChF7Cx4CP8kZJXcYuUkdDXG2JY3Yjx3RCEOZiGO2-yvR-sLuWk\_Y%2F40w%2F\_iAgS04NTiaUJOoc\_RkOtQ%2Fh7%2FNiBMGLvzUUwctelneqP9SvRmhvX1ImknBKMjL4xVw34&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df508dbda6b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343926935879355%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=5gYvuZhd2zNm0GNsmh9MWRW4MIFA0H8m04E4mnVmH%2Bo%3D&reserved=0> .  
\* 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 <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furl1005.email.actionnetwork.org%2Fss%2Fc%2FatcYNHk4Eh2YdGnwBh-YDL2pqlARv2wBshrgOqWkXMFLqFwnrZn2BLgqc\_LIUg9oOLaPB6j0T6dmZMZ1ITaiktOc--3j-PoKX2xtuzvY7mrB62YsSMaFn2Urff3TfHclYZkeIQeF\_THh9j5bfx-FBWgGPzFKjZxJPmTmH5ys\_jgruI9yZ\_2IzhIJSzD5FUWC42Sk-fNxEEk4RNrjVOSbQ8bvTUBkkEKtf5amgyN5D3WqpSpue5yBNR7fwkftmLxhsRKexAgJuicT0D9QgKNw-QoVC\_ylWNg3gDlm4Mvb14-vK65KNgx123Un3xpAmzZpH1MhyrbPwjJHZi4TgLW5JqBWM1unvdztIOyw6S1qdCYpchTStqv8QlonKK0SrhY0RUUpFVRKzuFSOe7Am3WzP1BflbX38XhfJkv7kUJLdA97rCV7LEEOTgMK5WJOPfQBWlo6kNif\_J2K0p6kBLV9MQ%2F40w%2F\_iAgS04NTiaUJOoc\_RkOtQ%2Fh8%2FBHMbbDahA\_\_5Aq8gk7DUGLLR1fVNTqG45cYjw-xqtEs&data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7Cda9bbc45a6e9493b9df508dbda6b5630%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343926935879355%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=m3ep3wCSFfjhw3mJnBrwpfYIFn4%2FS7w%2F9HrWGpzFg2A%3D&reserved=0> , increase in the epidemic of Missing &

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>* Customers would pay off the massive costs of fossil fuel infrastructure projects over many decades. To meet Washington’s climate targets, new fossil fuel projects will need to be retired well before they are paid off—potentially leaving customers on the hook for huge costs that they never benefit from.</p> <p>For all the foregoing reasons, please stand up to PSE’s unreasonable demand.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Rosemary Moore</p>
	Maddy Gerrish	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Maddy Gerrish</p>
	Dwight Rousu	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Deny PSE rate hikes to finance more greenhouse gas destruction of the planet.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Dwight Rousu</p>
	Kathy Schmitt	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Kathy Schmitt</p>
	Sunny Thompson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Sunny Thompson

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Gwen Hanson	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC members,</p> <p>I've participated in public hearings with PSE. Dozens of citizens pleaded with PSE not to build new dirty infrastructure. The testimonies were varied, vivid, passionate. Don Marsh even imagined a future where PSE leaders do the right thing and are honored.</p> <p>PSE cares not a smidge about their ratepayers. They are monolithic uncaring LNG devoted profit chasers.</p> <p>Please do not make us make more to support their world destroying agenda.</p> <p>Gwen Hanson, MD</p> <p>Citizens Climate Lobby &lt;<a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcitizensclimatelobby.org%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C7183269996f3488d04f608dbda44e1da%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343761751605713%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=M1FBjI9v%2Bc537depOV0JTKeFB6J5vquPs324xilh5Oc%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcitizensclimatelobby.org%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C7183269996f3488d04f608dbda44e1da%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343761751605713%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=M1FBjI9v%2Bc537depOV0JTKeFB6J5vquPs324xilh5Oc%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>&gt; , Bellevue Join us &lt;<a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcitizensclimatelobby.org%2Finformational-session%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C7183269996f3488d04f608dbda44e1da%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343761751605713%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=LFdItEJhUPTNt90vjqvWr%2FJv4BkI%2Fq3K8M9n%2BRi2UMA%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcitizensclimatelobby.org%2Finformational-session%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C7183269996f3488d04f608dbda44e1da%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638343761751605713%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=LFdItEJhUPTNt90vjqvWr%2FJv4BkI%2Fq3K8M9n%2BRi2UMA%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>&gt; to create the political will for a stable climate and empower individuals to have breakthroughs in exercising their personal and political power.</p>
	James Wesley	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>James Wesley</p>
	Cheryl Diamond	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Cheryl Diamond</p>
	Janice Shaw	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Janice Shaw

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

John birnel

E-mail

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>John birnel</p>
	Patrick McKee	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Patrick McKee</p>
	Karen Brown	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Karen Brown</p>
	Ronald Coleman	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Ronald Coleman</p>
	Michael Winger	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Michael Winger

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Maia Syfers	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I have spoken to the UTC more than once in the past during the sad history of the Tacoma LNG plant's development. Multiple legitimate points have been made by so many by now and I am sure that many will list and discuss them. Perhaps most importantly, LNG is not a transition fuel to clean energy because methane is many times more potent a GHG than carbon dioxide and the leakage factor of LNG projects is well documented. PSE is not a publicly owned utility but an investment corporation that pursues large infrastructure projects that it believes will provide the most profit for its investors. That goal is NOT compatible with the needs of its customers for reliable affordable clean energy or the emergent need to convert to actual clean energy to combat climate change. PSE customers should not be asked to pay for a disaster project that will not benefit them-it is estimated that customers would use approximately 2% of that maritime directed plant's energy yet are being asked to pay for over 40% of the construction costs. This is clearly outrageous and unjust. Rate increases that do not reflect any benefit for PSE customers should not be approved. The Puyallup tribe and the community of Tacoma have many times expressed their opposition to this dangerous and unnecessary plant whose permits are still being appealed by them. It is just plain obscene to ask ratepayers to now pay for it. Please act in the interests of the public and not corporate America. We should not have to keep appealing to both common sense and true concern for the public; we should just be able to expect both from our regulatory and oversight bodies.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Maia Syfers</p>
	Jenny Willoughby	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Jenny Willoughby</p>
	Christopher East	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Christopher East</p>
	Diane Dakin	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. This is for reasons of climate change and equity. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you,        Diane Dakin</p>
	Eric Richmond	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Eric Richmond

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Frida Weisman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 trust the tribes to know what is best for their people and the region, and support their voice in this matter.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Frida Weisman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nancy 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Johnson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Julie Moylan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Julie Moylan

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Julia Lakey	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 puts out green messages but its action plan relies on natural gas.</p> <p>End fossil fuel use!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Julia Lakey</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Bonnie Bledsoe	E-mail	<p>To: the Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Re: Puget Sound Energy Request for a Rate Increase</p> <p>I implore you to not grant a rate increase to Puget Sound Energy:</p> <p>Putting the financial burden on us (Seattle) to pay for PSE's Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility is a misuse of funds...we here would use an estimated 2% of energy for the facility and are being asked to pay for 43% of its cost.</p> <p>PSE needs to focus on green energy and serve the public, not operate as a for profit company.</p> <p>Additionally, the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility has been controversial from its inception:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It includes an 8 million gallon storage tank that was initially built without permit on unstable land fill in an earthquake zone adjacent to downtown Tacoma and the Puyallup Tribal land.</li> <li>• It presents an immediate environmental degradation that impacts the daily life of the Puyallup Tribe which has led them and Earthjustice to pursue a long legal battle contesting the issuing of a permit to PSE for the Tacoma LNG facility.</li> <li>• The immigrants living in the NW Detention Center are also currently exposed to extensive pollution from the LNG facility.</li> <li>• The LNG facility also exposes about 100,000 residents of Tacoma to potential jeopardy as they reside in the blast zone of the 8 million gallon tank were it to explode. Given its location in the earthquake zone on unstable landfill (as stated by geologists) this makes a potential explosion sufficiently feasible that a permit should never have been issued. It is inconceivable to understand what rationale of either PSE executives or the permitting body was used to even consider permitting and building an LNG facility in such a location?</li> </ul> <p>Thank you,  Bonnie Bledsoe</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Elizabeth Burton	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing in regard to Docket UG-230393. I urge you to deny PSE's requested rate increase.</p> <p>According to the UTC website, your mission is to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, reliable, and fairly priced.</p> <p>Raising rates on Puget Sound area utility customers so that PSE can pay for the Tacoma LNG plant is neither equitable nor fair. The use of LNG itself is not safe, equitable or reliable. Thus, the rate increase is contrary to your mission, and you should deny it.</p> <p>The gas used by the Tacoma LNG facility is extracted via the process of fracking. I hope that in your roles as Commissioners, you are familiar with the Compendium of Scientific, Medical, and Media Findings Demonstrating Risks and Harms of Fracking and Associated Gas and Oil Infrastructure; the 9th edition of this document was just recently released.</p> <p>The Compendium is compiled by health professionals, scientists, and medical organizations, and is a comprehensive collection of articles about the risks and harms of fracking, from three sources: articles from peer-reviewed medical and scientific journals; investigative reports by journalists; and reports from, or commissioned by, government agencies.</p> <p>The Compendium's findings can be summarized as follows: The vast body of scientific studies now published on hydraulic fracturing in the peer- reviewed scientific literature confirms that the public health and climate risks from fracking are real and the range of environmental harms wide. Our examination uncovered no evidence that fracking can be practiced in a manner that does not threaten human health directly or without imperiling climate stability upon which human health depends... The only method of mitigating its grave threats to public health and the climate is a complete and comprehensive ban on fracking. Indeed, a fracking phase-out is a requirement of any meaningful plan to prevent catastrophic climate change. (from Summary of Findings, p.10)</p> <p>Please note that the proposed use of the Tacoma LNG facility will prolong the use of fracking, possibly for decades.</p>
--	------------------	--------	--



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The authors list five reasons for the current ascendancy of the fracking industry in the United States in 2023. I call your attention to reason #4, since it is particularly relevant to your work: utilities and their regulators are operating in ways that lock in fossil fuel expansion and prolong natural gas-powered assets that would, in the absence of subsidies by ratepayers, likely be retired.

The authors note that fracking's long-term prospects are uncertain. Among the factors contributing to this uncertainty:

- 
- 
- Fracking
  - contradicts climate change commitments.
  - 
  - 
  -
- Methane
  - is a key driver of climate change, and fracking is a key driver of methane.
  -

Here are the major trends regarding fracking that the authors report; most of these contradict your mission:

- 1.
- 2.
3. Regulations
4. are incapable of preventing harm.
5.
  - a.
  - b.
  - c. Regulations
  - d. cannot prevent earthquake risks.
  - e.
  - f.
  - g.
  - h. Regulations
  - i. cannot prevent air pollution.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- j.
- k.
- l.
- m. Regulations
- n. cannot stop radioactive emissions.
- o.
- p.
- q.
- r. Regulations
- s. cannot stop wells from leaking.
- t.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8. Idle,
- 9. abandoned, and orphan wells contribute to air and water pollution and are a significant source of methane leakage.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13. Fracking
- 14. is accelerating the climate crisis.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
- 18. Fracking
- 19. contaminates and depletes drinking water sources.
- 20.
- 21.
- 22.
- 23. Fracking
- 24. creates air pollution at levels known to harm health.
- 25.
- 26.
- 27.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

28. Public
29. health problems associated with fracking include prenatal harm, respiratory impacts, cancer, heart disease, mental health problems, and premature death.
- 30.
- 31.
- 32.
33. Health
34. and safety risks for workers are severe and employment promises unrealized.
- 35.
- 36.
- 37.
38. Fracking
39. and the injection of fracking waste cause earthquakes.
- 40.
- 41.
- 42.
43. Fracking
44. waste disposal is a problem without a solution.
- 45.
- 46.
- 47.
48. Fracking
49. infrastructure poses exposure risks to those living nearby.
- 50.
- 51.
- 52.
53. Drilling
54. and fracking activity release radioactivity.
- 55.
- 56.
- 57.
58. Drilling
59. and fracking activities harm wildlife.
- 60.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- 61.
- 62.
63. The
64. economic instabilities of fracking exacerbate public health risks.
- 65.
- 66.
- 67.
68. The
69. social costs of fracking are severe.
- 70.
- 71.
- 72.
73. Fracking
74. violates principles of environmental justice and human rights.
- 75.
- 76.
- 77.
78. Carbon
79. capture and storage fails to mitigate the dangers of fracking.
- 80.

So, fracking itself, on which the LNG facility depends, is harmful in a multitude of ways; it threatens public safety and violates principles of equity and environmental justice. It thus does not serve the public interest.

Now let's consider LNG itself. Here is the summary of the findings on LNG (p. 533): LNG facilities encourage fracking by creating storage for the glut of gas that fracking has created, by enabling its export, and by driving up prices and profit margins. LNG facilities are capital-intensive and consist of liquefaction plants, import/export terminals, tanker ships, regasification terminals, and inland storage equipment.

Increased reliance on LNG poses risks of violating internationally agreed upon climate targets. LNG liquefaction requires immense energy in order to achieve the ultra-low temperatures required for condensation. An LNG facility typically requires its own power plant. Because they rely on

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

evaporative cooling, LNG tanks are leaky by design: to maintain the liquid at super-chilled temperatures and prevent explosions, vaporized methane is vented from storage tanks directly into the atmosphere. Larger tanks are engineered to capture boiled-off gas, but this process is not leak-proof. Before it is combusted or sent down a pipeline, LNG must be regasified via an energy-intensive process that requires massive infrastructure of its own, including periodic flaring to control pressure. Refrigeration, venting, leaks, flaring, and shipping make LNG more energy intensive than conventional natural gas. A recent analysis shows that exporting large quantities of LNG from the United States will likely cause global greenhouse gas emissions to rise not only because of its energy penalty but also because LNG exports add more fossil fuels to the global market and extend the lifespan of U.S. coal-fired plants.

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. In June 2022, a vapor cloud explosion and fire at the Freeport LNG facility in Texas closed the facility for eight months. No one inside the plant was injured, but lifeguards at a nearby beach were thrown from their chairs by the blast.

LNG plants create public health risks for nearby communities from toxic air pollutants including carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and volatile organic compounds.

Now let's consider PSE's claim that LNG provides a cleaner marine fuel than those currently in use. Three independent reports from authoritative bodies all conclude that use of LNG will, in fact, impede the necessary transition to zero-emissions fuels for ships, thus making the climate crisis worse, not better. They state that it should not be used. This is the conclusion of the World Bank, the International Council on Clean Transportation, and the International Maritime Organization, which is the United Nations's agency responsible for regulating emissions from international shipping. Please see the following reports:

- 
- 
- The
- Role of LNG in the Transition Toward Low- and Zero-Carbon Shipping,
- World Bank, April 16, 2021
-

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- 
- 
- The
- Climate Implications of Using LNG as a Marine Fuel,
- International Council on Clean Transportation, January 28, 2020

•

•

•

- The
- climate impact of Liquefied Natural Gas as a fuel for shipping,
- International Maritime Organization, September 27, 2019

•

In sum, there is no justification for making Puget Sound area residents pay a privately-owned, profit seeking company for its destructive, dangerous and misguided project, which jeopardizes their safety and health, and that of countless communities around the nation and the world.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Burton, PhD

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Broehe Karpenko	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Broehe Karpenko</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Niki Quester	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Clearly the LNG facility in Tacoma was a bad business decision for PSE. That being said, it is not fair for me to have to pay for their bad decision. Clearly, the UTC should DENY PSE the rate increase. It is the responsibility of the company and their shareholders to absorb the increased cost of the LNG facility!!!  Niki Quester</p>
	Stacy Oaks	E-mail	<p>I am submitting the comment below on behalf of Seattle Cruise Control.</p> <p>Thank you,  Stacy Oaks  Seattle Cruise Control  Steering Committee Member</p> <p>November 3rd, 2023</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Puget Sound Energy’s (PSE) requested rate increase, docket UG-230393.</p> <p>Seattle Cruise Control is a grassroots organization working to educate the public and elected</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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 away from this harmful industry. 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.

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, storage and fueling 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 and it traps 30 times more heat than carbon dioxide does over a 100-year period.

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 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

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Transportation (ICCT), a multinational NGO that researches energy and transportation policy. 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.

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.

We must also consider the environmental justice aspects of the LNG plant. Continued investments

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

in fossil 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.

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.

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.

Please deny all of PSE's requested rate increase.

Sincerely,  
Seattle Cruise Control

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michael Hughes	E-mail	<p>In regards to proposed rate hikes of natural gas, this seems to be just another way to keep raising energy rates based on unconfirmed "scientific" evidence regarding "global warming" put forth by the fascist Obama/Biden administration as it plans to assert government control over ALL aspects of citizens' lives.</p> <p>If this proposal is truly due to increasing costs (which I sincerely doubt), then PSE should do like everyone else is expected to do and cut their costs in other departments to account for the "increased" costs of operation.</p> <p>I am, therefore, opposed to these proposed rate hikes since there is no evidence to justify them.</p> <p>Michael Hughes</p>
	Alex Nickerson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Alex Nickerson

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Suzan Hirz	E-mail	<p>I am strongly opposed to PSE's rate increase request to fund the construction and development of the Tacoma LNG facility. Construction of this facility will be harmful for the environment and will not benefit the residential customers who are being ask to shoulder much of the cost. Given the catastrophic effects of climate change that are already becoming evident, customers should not be forced to fund new fossil fuel infrastructure. PSE needs to be encouraged to transition to clean energy as quickly as possible. They should not be allowed to put the interests of their investors over those of the citizens in our community. Also, it is not fair that residential ratepayers pay higher rates than commercial and industrial users. Everyone needs to be incentivized to conserve and transition to cleaner energy sources.</p> <p>Suzan Hirz</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Betty McNiel	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Betty McNiel</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Rev Meighan Pritchard	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 toward a more clean and just energy system. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area (Whidbey Island), I want to see my utility reflect my values and live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." I plan to install solar panels in the coming year to reduce my carbon footprint. I do not care to fund any form of fossil fuel infrastructure, which commits us for decades to raising carbon emissions instead of lowering them. Although I have the option to reduce my own carbon footprint, our society as a whole--and our energy infrastructure--must move ALL of us off fossil fuels. Further, my understanding is that PSE residential customers will only use 2% of fuel from the Tacoma LNG plant but are being asked to cover over 40% of the costs. That is an injustice. Please do not approve PSE's request for a rate increase.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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>
--	-----------------------	--------	--



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Rev Meighan Pritchard
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Catharine Cline</p>
	Elizabeth Braverman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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.

Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,

I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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."

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.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Braverman

We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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,  
Elizabeth Braverman

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mrs. Barbara Scavezze	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Barbara Scavezze</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ashlie Arthur	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 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 or expanded 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,  Ashlie Arthur</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Newman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kimberly Sims	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 cleaner and more 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 last thing PSE customers should have to do is pay a rate increase to fund the unlawfully built Tacoma LNG storage facility built on the land of the Puyallup Tribe. Truly an insult added to an unpardonable injury.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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 Kimberly Sims</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Patricia Kenney	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>As a customer of PSE, I do not want to pay for the shipping industry to use fossil fuels, especially at the expence of residential customers.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,          Patricia Kenney</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Melvin Mackey	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 Unitarian Universalist, 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 for our planet.”</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Melvin Mackey</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Amber Khan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Amber Khan

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	George aka Lanny Shuman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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." 100% of any future rate increases should be set aside for grants to individual and corporate customers to fund conversion to heat pump based heating system. None of the funds so generated should be used for PSE administrative costs. It is time for PSE to get out of the fossil fuel business.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. George aka Lanny Shuman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sandy Grace	E-mail	<p>Hi, I am strongly against this raise increase. We are struggling already to survive. Need to convert to clean energy and look out for the environment and our health. A company getting richer off our backs is so sad!</p> <p>Also: PSE wants to raise residential gas rates by 3.45%. This is unacceptable when PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility and many customers are struggling or unable to pay their bills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE pursues large infrastructure projects that maximize profits for its investors, but which have not been shown to make measurable improvements in reliability metrics or the daily lives of PSE customers.</li> </ul> <p>Please stand up for us ordinary people and prevent this increase!! Thanks, Sandy Grace</p>
	Jesse Landry	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jesse Landry

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	John Lindsay	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. John Lindsay</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Marie Brissette	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Marie Brissette</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	CHRISTOPHER SANDFORD	E-mail	<p>Hello:</p> <p>I have received your form notice about a proposed price increase (or 'adjustment', as it's called) to Puget Sound Energy's Liquefied Natural Gas. I am one of those already hard-pressed consumers who would be directly affected by such an increase, and I would like to raise my voice strongly to oppose it.</p> <p>The various technical facts and figures of the matter may very well be as given in your notice, but over and above that I would politely draw your attention to the human factor involved: although I of course speak only for myself in this email, there must be many thousands of other individuals and families who are already struggling hard with the realities of the runaway inflation currently affecting the cost of every conceivable food and commodity, for whom this is the very worst possible news to be confronted with just as another biting cold winter begins to assert itself. In my own case - and, again, I somehow doubt I am completely alone in this - my family has already had to face the unpleasant choice of properly outfitting our school-age child for the cold weather, or forfeiting a communal hot meal on two designated nights a week. These are conditions that I suspect are broadly familiar to many other hardworking families such as ours, and are not those, frankly, that one would ideally associate with life in the United States in the year 2023; they reek more of the Depression era. It is almost beyond belief that Puget Sound Energy should choose this precise moment in our community's collective struggle merely to put adequate food on the table to propose yet another significant price increase, coming as it would immediately on top of what I notice was just such another 'adjustment' in the very recent past.</p> <p>For all of the above reasons, and several others besides, please therefore count my voice as strongly opposed to the proposed price increase described in your form.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>CHRISTOPHER SANDFORD</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Russell Dial	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Decommission the LNG facility; it's a ticking time bomb of environmental destruction. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Russell Dial</p>
	<p>Meghan Anderson</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Meghan Anderson</p>
	<p>ANN  GIANTVALLEY</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>Since you are publicly traded, you have money to spare. I suggest you use some of those profits to build whatever you think is necessary. Stop rewarding your stock holders, CEO, middle management with bonuses/ shares/ profit margins. Don't put this on the backs of your customers, most of whom are beholden to you as there is not an option for power companies. Cut the GREED! And, on to of that, LPG is not a viable fuel source for our precious planet.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you and WAKE UP to environmental concerns and cutting your greed!        ANN GIANTVALLEY</p>
	Gina Singh	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Gina Singh</p>
	Katheryn Ridgley	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Kathryn Ridgley</p>
	<p>ANNA          WILBANKS</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			ANNA WILBANKS
	Sarah Stone	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Sarah Stone</p>
	Christine Hickey	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Rights Commission.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Christine Hickey</p>
	<p>Joni Vanderburg  Paner</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Joni Vanderburg Paner</p>
	Emily Johnston	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Emily Johnston</p>
	<p>Rebecca Kinnestrand</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Rebecca Kinnestrand</p>
	John Smith	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  John Smith</p>
	Tom Craighead	E-mail	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          Tom Craighead</p>
	<p>Bradley          Thompson</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Bradley Thompson</p>
	Melissa Roberts	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Melissa Roberts</p>
	Richard Young	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Richard Young</p>
	Kathleen Forman	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Kathleen Forman</p>
	<p>Nancyrose  Houston</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Nancyrose Houston</p>
	Barbara Menne	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  I have lived in Tacoma for 29 years and want PSE to step into the energy future instead of clinging to the old paradigm of fossil fuels and then transferring the expenses of new fossil fuel infrastructure to us, the residential ratepayers.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Barbara Menne
	Esther Day	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Esther Day</p>
	Dane Meyer	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>Rights Commission.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          p.s. In my observation, PSE has routinely manipulated the truth and is not an organization to be trusted.          Dane Meyer</p>
	<p>Joel Hildebrandt</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Joel Hildebrandt</p>
	m'lou christ	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should NEVER have agreed to the Tacoma LNG facility &amp; it certainly should NOT RECEIVE ANY RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER RATE INCREASE TO PAY FOR IT!</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  m'lou christ</p>
	nancy corr	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  <b>WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY FOR PSE’S INCREASING USE OF FOSSIL FUEL !</b>  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  nancy corr</p>
	Barbara Stevenson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Barbara Stevenson

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Judy Knold	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Please put your thinking caps on!          Find other ways to fund the project. We, the people, do not have unlimited funds!!!!!!! We cannot pay for everything! Think!!! Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>
--	------------	--------	--



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Judy Knold</p>
	James Kuhlman	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          James Kuhlman</p>
	Leo Kucewicz	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Leo Kucewicz

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ronald Snell	E-mail	<p>Members and staff of the State Utility and Transportation Commission</p> <p>I am opposed to the current rate increase request of 3.45% by PSE for natural gas. Included in this rate increase are investments by PSE that do not benefit natural gas rate payers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE continues to expand its gas infrastructure which is in conflict with state climate policy. This policy was made clear last year when the State Building Code Commission approved an update to the state building code which eliminates gas in new buildings for heating and hot water. While the final details of the state code are still being reviewed, the direction of state policy is clear.</li> <li>• We can expect to see the demand for gas to decline in the coming years, not increase. A number of communities in PSE’s natural gas market are already encouraging homeowners and other building owners to replace gas appliances with clean, efficient electric appliances such as highly efficient heat pumps. I have already acted on incentives offered by Kirkland and other cities and replace my gas furnace with a heat pump. Many other residents are making similar decisions. Given this trend, there is no justification for PSE to continue to expand its gas infrastructure.</li> <li>• PSE is trying to force rate payers to pay for part of the construction of the Tacoma Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) facility. This facility is targeted for the use by the shipping industry and has no value whatsoever to PSE’s residential and business customers. It is even possible that the construction of the facility is illegal. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are currently appealing permits for this controversial facility in court. Under no circumstance should PSE gas rate payers be forced to help pay for this LNG facility.</li> </ul> <p>Respectfully,  Ronald Snell</p>
	Barbara Stevenson	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Barbara Stevenson
	Leo Kucewicz	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Leo Kucewicz</p>
	Michelle Williams	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice and should not exist if we are to meet our climate targets. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact the Puyallup Tribe and immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers. Also, PSE is already the most expensive power around. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Michelle Williams</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ruchi Stair	E-mail	<p>I am submitting a comment on the 2023 request by PSE for a rate increase. I urge the Utilities &amp; Transportation Commission to stop approving rate increases that force customers to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure, such as fossil gas and liquified fossil gas.</p> <p>The focus needs to be on renewables and energy storage that will improve reliability. Please consider green hydrogen as a possible energy storage during peak energy production.</p> <p>When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must consider health costs, environmental and climate impact costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fossil gas has considerable climate impact costs, as methane is over 80 times more harmful to global warming as carbon dioxide in the initial twenty years, according to the EPA. Future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, and worsening wildfire seasons must be considered.</li> <li>• Fossil gas has significant health impacts stemming from the VOCs emitted in homes and buildings, according to the American Lung Association.</li> <li>• Approval for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must set aside funds to mitigate impacts related to fracking: poisoned water tables; earthquakes; destruction of habitat; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</li> </ul> <p>--  Sincerely,  Ruchi Stair</p>
	Diane Mckenzie	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Diane Mckenzie

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Phillip Hope

E-mail

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,  
Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  
The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  
The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.  
The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  
PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Phillip Hope</p>
	Ann Dorsey	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Ann Dorsey</p>
	<p>Anja Roozen</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Anja Roozen

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dr. Teresa Osborn	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Teresa Osborn</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dr. Van Hardison	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 and enabling more fossil fuel production is directly opposed to that goal.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Van Hardison</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Christiansen Martinez	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 must be responsible to the generations who come after us-consider CLIMATE CHANGE.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Christiansen Martinez</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lynn Colson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Lynn Colson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Dianna MacLeod	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Dianna MacLeod</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Erik LaRue</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Poly Taylor	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Poly Taylor</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mrs. Connie Campbell	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Connie Campbell</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Robert Brown	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Robert Brown</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms Mary ellen Smith	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Mary ellen Smith</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Raney 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 or expanded 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 member of a progressive faith community, Plymouth Church, I believe we must care for our communities justly and help the planet too by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. Fracked natural Gas is Not the way to go about this goal. Keep it in the ground, bc extracting it is immeasurably harmful to drinking water not to mention the downstream effects of fossil fuel use. As someone who lives in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, I don't want to see my utility bills conflict with my values but want to see PSE live into its stated ethic to "do what is right." Those affected negatively most by the proposed Tacoma LNG facility such as tribes, would not see benefits from it such as their heating bills go down. Neither would I! It would only narrowly benefit the Marine Industry.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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, Raney Newman</p>
--	--------------	--------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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, Karen Dalenius</p>
--	----------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Celeste Maris	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 were opposed to the project, so let the investors pay for it.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Celeste Maris</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. 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 or expanded 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 at least my second letter in opposition of your proposal to burden the area's customers with the costs of a most unwelcome and misguided LNG facility. Any costs should be borne by stockholders foolish enough to invest their money in fossil fuel, no matter what its form!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Frances Blair</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments: 756**

**In Favor: 3**

**Opposed: 747**

**Undecided: 6**

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nancy Hansen	E-mail	***See attachment for comment***  To Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Re Docket UG-230393  Comment submitted by: Nancy Hansen

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Kilby</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	L Dong	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
L Dong

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Margo Rolf	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Margo Rolf</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Cheron Holman	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Because we are in a climate crisis brought on by the burning of fossil fuels, I strongly oppose the continuation or expansion of the use of fossil fuels. 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. For that reason, I strongly oppose the building of the Tacoma LNG facility. It adds insult to injury for Puget Sound Energy to force me to pay for the facility through this proposed rate increase.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Cheron Holman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sarah Schmidt	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 live in Puget Sound Energy’s service area, and 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 or expanded 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 Sarah Schmidt</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jennifer MacDonald	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Jennifer MacDonald</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Joseph McGee	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Joseph McGee</p>
	Mary ellen Smith	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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 Mary ellen Smith</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tiffany MacBain E-mail

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,  
Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  
The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  
The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.  
The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  
PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Tiffany MacBain</p>
	Jeanne Poirier	E-mail	<p>Thank you for allowing comment on this and for public testimony this evening - trust you will listen to the environmental groups among others whom I agree with. There is no room for this methane facility on Puyallup tribe Tacoma flats. The siting of this facility is atrocious! By population, schools, incarceration and into the Puget Sound which is already suffering from these kinds of pollution and more.</p> <p>Stuff it down customers throats to pay for their own extinction? No way.</p> <p>Sorry to not be part of tonight's meeting - and perhaps from content already shared, maybe a good thing.</p> <p>Make the right decision. In today's world there is no way this project should be finished, implemented, operational!</p> <p>Jeanne Poirier</p>
	William Kupinse	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington State Utilities &amp; Transportation Commissioners:</p> <p>I write regarding Puget Sound Energy's request for a 3.45% rate increase (Docket UG-230393). As a longtime Tacoma resident who is familiar with the issues at hand, and who has attended several UTC hearings over PSE rate increase requests in person, I urge you to deny PSE's latest request for the following reasons.</p> <p>This rate increase would go toward reimbursing PSE for its LNG refinery and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Tacomans protested at length against this fracked gas facility, which is built upon the traditional lands of the Puyallup Tribe. Both the Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice have ongoing appeals in court against the LNG facility. It is wrong to require Tacomans to pay to support this injustice that we oppose with all our hearts.</p> <p>PSE's LNG facility is primarily a for-profit enterprise selling marine fuel, with the excuse that some small percentage of capacity might conceivably be directed to residential customers tacked on as a rationale for offloading the expense onto the public. The public should not be subsidizing</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>corporate profit-seeking. It is wrong to require Tacomans to reimburse PSE for its risky and ill-advised business scheme.</p> <p>We live in a time of climate crisis. Around the globe, millions of people are being displaced by drought and extreme weather. Here in the once-temperate Pacific Northwest, a heat dome killed hundreds of people in 2019. The smoke from wildfires is becoming a seasonal occurrence. Warming waters threaten the existence of salmon and other marine life. To build a fracked gas fossil fuel plant at this time of climate crisis as PSE has done is to act with depraved indifference. To require Tacomans to pay for the harm we have worked so hard to prevent is to add insult to injury.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy is a monopoly. We, the residents of Tacoma, depend upon you, the Washington State Utilities &amp; Transportation Commissioners, to protect us from PSE's dangerous profit-seeking schemes. I implore you to do so by denying Puget Sound Energy's latest rate increase request.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>William Kupinse</p>
	Yen La	E-mail	<p>To Whom it may concern:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>No rate increase!</p> <p>Thanks, Yen La</p>
	Alison Hale	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Alison Hale
--	--	--	-------------

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Amber Saldivar	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 this proposal would certainly not support my values. Please do NOT increase our rates to pay for this, it is not a good use of the money! I support finding more climate-friendly ways to use the money we pay into PSE.</p> <p>Sincerely, Amber Saldivar</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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, Amber Saldivar</p>
--	----------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robin Plotnik	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Robin Plotnik</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	dakota.ra94@gmail.com	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	-----------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Liz Campbell	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry. Producing and using gas emits methane, at the drilling and excavation site and at processing facilities. Methane is a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon. LNG therefore is exacerbating global warming. Not only that, building this facility before permitting was completed and dismissing entirely the voices of the Puyallup tribal members dissent and the environmental harm this facility will create, outside of global warming, is heinous.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard. A rate increase to residential customers is not warranted and an insult.</p> <p>Thank you.        Liz Campbell</p>
	<p>Jordan Van Voast</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Customers are already struggling to pay their bills &amp; should not have to pay for PSE’s poor investment choices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>• PSE wants to raise residential gas</li> <li>• rates by 3.45%. This is unacceptable when PSE is already Washington’s most expensive utility and many customers are struggling or unable to pay their bills.</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>• PSE pursues large infrastructure</li> <li>• projects that maximize profits for its investors, but which have not been shown to make measurable improvements in reliability metrics or the daily lives of PSE customers.</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>• PSE has not proven that large projects</li> <li>• like the Tacoma LNG refinery are a prudent investment for ratepayers.</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- 
- Many of PSE's past projects have
- been vigorously opposed by PSE's customers and are manifestly harmful to the environment.
- 

PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

- 
- 
- The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice
- are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court.
- 
- 
- 
- 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.
- 
- 
- 
- 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.
- 
- o
- o
- o Even if LNG was cleaner, the cost
- o of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be borne by residential customers. Residential customers would only use approximately 2% of the use of the facility, yet are being asked to pay for 43% of the construction costs.
- o
-



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- - This facility is predicated on PSE's
  - false assertion that 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.
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - Additional Background Info on Tacoma
  - LNG:
  - Native
  - Daily Network's Coverage of Tacoma LNG Resistance
  -
- The Utilities & Transportation Commission should stop approving rate increases that force customers to pay for new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure.
- - 
  - PSE is not investing sufficiently
  - in 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.
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 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.
  - 
  - o
  - o
  - o When PSE wants to build more gas

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

- o infrastructure, the cost of exacerbating the climate crisis with more methane
- o emissions should be considered,
- o including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health
- o costs
- o related to these events.
- o
- o
- o
- o Approving reimbursement for infrastructure
- o that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs related to fracking: poisoned water tables; earthquakes; destruction of habitat;
- o violations
- o of Indigenous sovereignty,
- o increase in the epidemic of Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.
- o
- o
- o
- o Customers would pay off the massive
- o costs of fossil fuel infrastructure projects over many decades. To meet Washington's climate targets, new fossil fuel projects will need to be retired well before they are paid off—potentially leaving customers on the hook for huge costs that they never benefit
- o from.
- o

--

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE -- This email is intended only for the person(s) named in the message header. Unless otherwise indicated, it contains information that is confidential, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender of the error and delete the message. Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Every single act of kindness makes all the difference in the world.

Jordan Van Voast, Licensed Acupuncturist  
on Duwamish/coast Salish traditional land  
CommuniChi Acupuncture Clinic

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jennifer Houston	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Information from Yale Environment 360 says we do not need LNG facilities. We reached the peak need and now it is declining.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,          Jennifer Houston</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Jenna Judge	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	-------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Jenna Judge</p>
	Rev. Richard Gibson	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Rev. Richard Gibson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Faith Stevens

E-mail

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,  
Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  
The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  
The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.  
The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  
PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Faith Stevens</p>
	WELDON NISLY	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. WELDON NISLY</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sherry Bupp	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Sherry Bupp</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Margaret SUTRO	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 stand with the Puyallup Tribe in saying NO to making individuals and families take on the burden of paying for commercial uses of fossil fuel infrastructure. Thank you for your leadership in helping make a fair just economy in our region.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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 SUTRO</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lucy 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Lucy JOHNSON</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	<p>Hannah Lindell-Smith</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	-----------------------------	---------------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Hannah Lindell-Smith

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Dale and Pamela Wright	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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, we believe we must care for our communities and planet by moving towards a more clean and just energy system. We are Puget Sound Energy customers, so we want to see our utility reflect our values and live its stated ethic to "do what is right."  Thank you.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Dale and Pamela Wright</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Ashley Ouellette	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Ashley Ouellette</p>
	Ms. Liisa Wale	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Liisa Wale</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Joe Wiederhold	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Joe Wiederhold</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Richard Johnson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Nikoli Stevens	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects</p> <p>Nikoli Stevens</p>
--	----------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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, Deborah Hagen-Lukens</p>
--	----------------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Kevin O'Brien</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. 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 or expanded 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>Charging energy consumers to violate Puyallup treaty rights by building unwanted fossil fuel infrastructure is unconscionable.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Christopher Buckley</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Ms. Kristen Kalbrener	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>As someone who works in CleannEnerhy for the public good, I cannot support any further investment in fossil fuels.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Kristen Kalbrener</p>
--	-----------------------	--------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kate Lunceford	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Kate Lunceford</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Bonnie 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Bonnie Miller</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ms. Jennifer Cartwright	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 is time to shift away from polluting fossil fuels! Please invest in renewable energy sources instead. Our earth is crying and all beings on this earth are suffering.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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. Jennifer Cartwright</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Alison Feise	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Alison Feise</p>
	Joan Nolan	E-mail	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  
The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Joan Nolan

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Brian Green	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Brian Green</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	AC Churchill	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  AC Churchill</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robert 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 or expanded 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." No rate hike for sure. Find another way to pay for your new construction or remodel.</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  Robert Johnson</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Melissa Anderson Trust	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  Melissa Anderson Trust</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	terra 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 or expanded 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 or expanded 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,  terra anderson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mr. Larry Schneider	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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 or expanded 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. Larry Schneider</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jenny Chan	E-mail	<p>Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment</p> <p>I do not support the proposed increase in rates. Why should the consumer pay for a new facility when PSE is the one that will benefit and they are a FOR PROFIT company. I do not think the public should be paying for a facility that they will benefit from for years to come when they have hundreds millions in profit. " PSE made \$293 million in earnings in 2019, of which they paid out \$165 million in dividends to parent company Puget Energy. "</p> <p>--  Thanks,  Jenny Chan</p>
	MARCIA NEU	Phone	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy’s proposed rate increases to pay for new or expanded 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>Besides the ecological reasons, this rate increase to pay for an optional commercially related capital project is an unjust "tax" on residential customers who are struggling to pay high electricity costs to heat homes and support basic human needs.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Do not fund the Tacoma LNG project on the backs of consumers who will not benefit from it. Reject this rate increase, please!</p> <p>We cannot create a just and clean energy system if Washington families are paying for new or expanded 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,  MARCIA NEU</p>
	David Kristensen	Web	<p>Regarding the May 25th, 2023 rate request of 3.45% from PSE to support the LNG terminal in Tacoma that is nearing completion. I would like to express my opposition to this increase. It appears that the main benefit of this facility is PSE's ability to sell CNG to TOTE Maritime. I am in favor of the potential benefits to the climate for switching to a cleaner fuel source for these vessels. However, it seems that throwing a rate increase on all PSE customers when there is minimal impact to them is asking us to unreasonably subsidize the fuel costs to TOTE Maritime and other similar companies. Let the costs of this facility go proportionally to those who receive the benefits. Have PSE disclose where this gas will be going to.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rebecca Post	Web	Reference Docket UG-230393. The proposed Tacoma LNG facility seems to play a large role in commercial transportation issues. Yet the rate schedule reflects no increase in any of the transportation services. It seems unfair that Residential use is proposed to increase by 3.51% yet the major benefits are for transportation. I would think the UTC would see this disparity and correct but proposing an increase in Transportation services rates and lowering the increase for residential.
	Paul C Magnussen	Web	RE: Docket UG-230393 I am writing to urge you to reject PSE's request to pass on the cost of their Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility to consumers with a rate hike. This cost should be absorbed by PSE as the cost of doing business. Especially, if they plan to export gas to China and other nations from this plant. Our rates are already too high!
	Saeed	Web	Referring to Docket UG-230393.
	Gina Frankele	Web	Washington State collects enough taxes to cover this increase and most residents are tired of covering things that should be paid by the state. Not to mention we are in a recession and cannot afford increases on out bills.
	Silvan Urfer	Web	Gas cost has almost doubled over the last two years. There is zero economic reason for this, and there is no reason for PSE to keep gouging consumers like this.
	Mei Yang	Web	I protest PSE's request to increase rate of liquefied natural gas. I live in Redmond, WA, not near Tacoma. To recover the costs incurred for Tacoma LNG facility is NOT an acceptable reason to increase rate for customers residing out of Tacoma. PSE increased rate last year and my bill is now at least 10% higher every month, though the usage is unchanged. I don't accept they are increasing rate again.
	Saud Al-Mishari	Web	Re: Docket UG-230393.  I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rate increase by Puget Sound Energy

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

(PSE) to recover the costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility (LNG Facility). I urge you to reject this request and protect the interests of the ratepayers and the environment.

PSE claims that the LNG Facility is necessary to provide reliable and affordable natural gas service to its customers, especially during peak demand periods. However, this claim is not supported by evidence or sound analysis. In fact, the LNG Facility is a risky and unnecessary investment that will harm the public health, safety, and welfare.

First, the LNG Facility is not needed to meet the current or future demand for natural gas in PSE's service territory. According to PSE's own Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), the company has sufficient pipeline capacity and storage resources to serve its customers until at least 2035<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, PSE has not demonstrated that the LNG Facility is the least-cost option to address any potential reliability issues. PSE has not considered alternative solutions, such as demand-side management, energy efficiency, renewable energy, or battery storage, that could reduce or defer the need for new gas infrastructure<sup>2</sup>.

Second, the LNG Facility is not consistent with the state's climate goals and policies. The LNG Facility will increase greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to global warming. PSE's analysis of the environmental impacts of the LNG Facility is flawed and incomplete. PSE has underestimated the lifecycle emissions of LNG production, transportation, and combustion<sup>3</sup>. PSE has also ignored the significant methane leakage from fracking and pipeline operations, which has a much higher global warming potential than carbon dioxide<sup>4</sup>. Furthermore, PSE has not accounted for the social cost of carbon, which is a measure of the economic damages caused by climate change<sup>5</sup>.

Third, the LNG Facility is not fair or equitable to the ratepayers. PSE is asking its customers to pay for a project that will primarily benefit a few large industrial users, such as Totem Ocean Trailer Express (TOTE) and Puget Sound Energy Generation (PSEG). These users will receive preferential rates and contracts from PSE, while residential and small commercial customers will bear the burden of higher rates and environmental costs<sup>6</sup>. This is contrary to the principle of cost-of-service regulation, which requires that rates reflect the actual cost of providing service to each customer class<sup>7</sup>.

In conclusion, I urge you to deny PSE's request to increase rates for the LNG Facility. This project

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			is not in the public interest and does not comply with the legal standards for rate setting. PSE should use its profits, which amounted to \$293 million in 2019, to fund capital infrastructure investments and not through rate increases. Thank you for your consideration.
	Nicole Smith	Web	<p>I understand these hikes are supposed to target having cleaner sources of energy. While I fully support clean energy, I must also consider the rate hike and its affect on my community.</p> <p>It seems everything has gone up in price lately. For the average resident, simply living (paying rent, utilities, food costs) has become significantly more challenging in the last two years. For something as basic and necessary as heat in the winter, it seems unconscionable to increase rates at this time. This proposed hike comes after a series of price hikes in recent years that have surpassed any kind of similar increases in median or average salaries locally, all while the Greater Seattle Area is seeing increases in people facing homelessness and food insecurity. UTC policy also prevents any sense of transparency due to "preventing" PSE from noting these hikes on bills and so fellow customers probably won't even fully understand why their bill went up. If any of those who have a say in this matter have a heart bigger than their wallets, I implore you to reconsider a rate hike until the economic situation for our area has improved.</p>
	Billie Jo Clary	Web	We pay enough!
	Mark Koehn	Web	It appears that the principal beneficiaries of the LNG facility in Tacoma are TOTE Maritime and certain other maritime transportation companies. PSE's proposed rate change affects various service receivers (Schedules 23, 53, 31, 41, 85, 86, and 87) but none of the transportation services (Schedules 31T, 41T, 85T, 86T, 87T, and 88T). Why should residential customers (for one group) pay for the construction/operation of this LNG terminal when they are not the beneficiaries of it? I know they say it will help residential and other customers when it is cold, but without this extra capacity presently, we have not had a shortage of natural gas that I am aware of, so this "benefit" seems hollow, at best.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jeff and Tracy Gibbs	Web	My comment is regarding Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment (UG-230393). I am voicing my objection of PSE to recover the costs incurred for the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility. The new facility is to provide liquid natural gas to the shipping company TOTE Marine which serves Alaska and Puerto Rico. The background information indicate TOTE has put into service two new vessels which are powered by LNG. I believe TOTE intends to launch additional LNG powered vessels. The purpose of the new PSE LNG plant in Tacoma is to provide LNG to TOTE. Simply put, we do not believe it is fair to raise our LNG rates to provide a corporation with fuel which they in turn will use to profit from. There is no mention of the intent by TOTE or any future users of the Tacoma plant LNG production to pay back the infrastructure costs to the public who is burdened with the cost of building the plant.
	John R	Web	I am against any rate increases In natural gas or any other costs, especially during this restricted economy where we are facing such high inflation rates.
	christopher m. peeters, p.e.	Web	Puget Sound Energy expects WA ratepayers to absorb their failed investment burden for the construction of a for-profit export-centric Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) terminal. Furthermore PSE's 'plan' identifies disproportionate residential and commercial rate increases (e.g. "tariffs") to offset the LNG project losses. PSE (a for-profit utility) should bear the FULL brunt of avoidable business/management mistakes, with that burden shared fully and ONLY by shareholders/investors, and certainly NOT utility customers. Neither residential nor commercial ratepayers should pay ANY of PSE's proposed pro-rata costs. AND: PSE has historically benefitted from generous rate WA increases when bulk/contract purchase prices of natural gas had, in fact, fallen below those provided as tariff basis. STOP THE PROLONGED RIPOFF.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	SUSAN SCHNEIDER	Web	NO INCREASE. You should be embarrassed to even ask. Here's why in your own words: UTC 1/23: "As a result of both the approved settlements and the power cost adjustment, the typical residential electric customer using 800 kWh of energy per month can expect a total increase of about \$8.73 per month in 2023 and an additional \$1.48 in 2024." and now... "The typical natural gas residential customer using 64 therms per month can expect a total increase of about \$4.87 per month in 2023 and an additional \$1.34 per month in 2024."
	Raheel Hameed	Web	Docket UG-230393. I, hereby, oppose the rate increase proposed by PSE. Mainly due to the fact that I believe PSE is already charging a lot for electricity and natural gas. They should not add more burden on the customers. They should absorb any new costs themselves. It's not that they are not earning anything.
	Holly	Web	Raising rates to cover construction costs isn't fair when the executives have such outrageously high salaries. The general public is struggling financially as are a huge number of businesses. Please stop passing on every expense to the customers who have no other option but to continue to pay the only gas company we have.
	Earnest Hoagland	Web	unhappy about the rate increase, it isn't affordable for consumers.
	Michelle Li	Web	We strongly disagree with the proposed rate increase by PSE. The company has already charged high rates and have increased by a lot year over year. Their proposed rate increase Re: Docket UG-230393 is very unreasonable.  Thanks. Michelle Li

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Larry Ray	Web	The price increase your company has proposed is hard on family at this time because of the cost living increases over the past two years. I spent almost \$20,000 dollars this year to replace and older less efficient heat pump system with a high efficient system. I was expecting to see a savings but with the price increase, I will be seeing an increase. Now is not the time to increase PSE rates.
	Fa Duc	Web	Having a hard time swallowing yet another residential rate increase for this LNG cost recoup when I have found no where in their PR that a majority or any of the LNG will be used in Thurston County. The rate increases are not delivered with equity.
	Robert W Gill	Web	It is totally unacceptable that a privately held, corporation that pays regular dividends to it's investors( not public but investment firms and pension funds) propose a capital equipment capacity increase or a new facility and place that cost burden on the customers, not themselves. No public company would ever be permitted to raise capital in this manner or to obligate their customers directly to the borrowing of this expansion. Profits need to be reduced if they deem this new facility is worthwhile, not rates increased.  The utility commission should reject this proposal outright.
	Troy Klein	Web	Regarding the Puget Sound energy Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment proposal I am not in favor. Due to the current overall economic climate in the state of Washington including factors such as inflation and what I believe may be a pending economic downturn i think the UTC should use caution in any increase in rates for power supply items that would affect residential as well as commercial consumers. Costs for almost all basic items have increased quite a bit over the last few years and continuing to increase things that are essentially necessities would add to what is already becoming a hardship for many people.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Don Hollander	Web	Washington state residents already pay more for gasoline than most states thanks to our high taxes and couple that with rising inflation and you get families who can barely afford to pay their bills. This new rate increase is not necessary. PSE makes over 4 billion a year Their CEO earns over 4 million a year and the median income of their employees is 126,000 per year. That's really great for a private company who has a monopoly on our energy. Let the company pay for their own research and development and not pass it on to their customers. If anything they should step up and set a good example for other companies and reduce rates so that their customers can get a break from increases. Please don't increase rates at this time. Thank you for your time.
	Laura Squire	Web	I am against any rate hike. PSE is a privately held monopoly. Executives from this company are making obscene amounts of money off the backs of consumers that have no other choices for their gas services. I grew up in a time when utilities were non-profit. We need to go back to that model so that energy is affordable for everyone. No on any rate increases. They can reinvest their profits to expand and improve their facilities.
	Matthew McCoy	Web	This is for Docket UG-230393. Investing in infrastructure is part of the costs of doing business with an expectation of increased revenue in the future. They can expect to recoup those costs at a later date.  In addition, and just as importantly, if not more so, the "equity" return that PSE is currently getting is far too high. There is no basis for such a high return on such a low risk asset. It is time for them to take a cut in the equity return. If a lower return is not satisfactory to them, I suggest the state/city/county should step in a turn the utility into a publicly owned one.  Thank you, Matthew McCoy, PHD
	Debra K Burleson	Web	Ref. Docket UG-230393. If the LNG plant cannot pay for itself through its customer base, it should not exist.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Eric Fish	Web	With an increase in residential rates of 2.5% caused by the legislature's CCA, and now a proposal that reads that another increase 3.5% for natural gas rates. What benefit does this plant provide to PSE users other than provide service to the Port of Tacoma commercial shipping residents. I'm in favor of increases that benefit the users of the facility only. Place no more place burden on residential customers. Kind Regards.
	Cori Belle	Web	I am not in favor of the new rate increases. If this is PSE's way to pay for the carbon-free goals of our governor, I urge you to find another way to do it. Gas is a clean, efficient, affordable energy source, and Washington residents should not be penalized for using it. This is an awful time to increase rates, as inflation is still high and is hitting us hard with food and gasoline prices. We cannot afford for our utilities to also go up.
	Yi Lu	Web	I don't think increase the rate is the right move, considering the service we received.
	arlen notch	Web	Raising natural gas rates is no way to combat inflation, especially for us natural gas users!
	Chelsia Berry	Web	I am NOT in favor of the proposed overall increase in natural gas rates of 3.45% to collect the costs incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility. Again, I am not in favor of PSE's requested rate adjustment.
	Xia Yan He	Web	We strongly disagree with PSE raising price.
	khushbu Patel	Web	Please no rate increase for natural gas or anything

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kristen Smith	Web	<p>PSE is proposing a 3.45% increase to natural gas rates to recover costs incurred from construction and development of the the TLNGF.</p> <p>This is in addition to huge increases already sustained from the state of Washington's horrific Climate Commitment Act (CCA). WA gov't encourage PSE to withhold the full impact of this TAX from customers by not including it as a line-item in our bills. PSE, so far, has complied and we have not seen this critical information on our bills. The message? PSE doesn't care what climate legislation will do to its customers because it will just pass the bill on to us. PSE is essentially a gov't monopoly. We can't really go to anyone else, so we can only speak out against more rate increases directly to local governments and PSE.</p> <p>And we have seen increase after increase in our energy bills. Our natural gas bill has doubled since CCA. It costs \$10 just to flick the switch to our natural gas fireplace and \$50 to run it for a few minutes. We cannot afford to replace the natural gas appliances and hook-ups that came with our home. Besides, in five years someone will have discovered that electricity has a larger negative impact on the environment and natural gas is actually the least harmful. Again. We keep seeing this cycle between forms of energy and home-owners are the ones caught in the cross-fire of current political machinations.</p> <p>If PSE wants to recover costs like this incurred from normal use, PSE can first use it's huge political influence to make WA legislature walk back the CCA. Next, PSE can shoulder more of the CCA cost and insert it as a line-item on all bills to ensure gov't transparency, and THEN come back to customers with more rate increase requests.</p>
	Alan R Winslow	Web	<p>Re. Docket UG-230393</p> <p>PSE is asking existing rate payers to pay higher natural gas rates so that PSE can recover certain costs directly related to its Tacoma LNG facility. The LNG facility provides NO benefit to existing residential natural gas users. We should not be asked or required to subsidize or pay for any PSE expenses related to the Tacoma LNG facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kenny	Web	With the economy going down, and CPI going up, residents are difficult to maintain similar living conditions. PSE as a public service company should take more responsibilities and delay the gas fee increase
	Richard Brooks	Web	I don't think it is fair to PGE's residential customers given the current economic climate given wages are not keeping pace with inflation. Food and gas (for autos) are skyrocketing, which is painful enough right now. It seems utilities have gone up on a regular basis, every 1-3 years, where personal incomes have not. Please do not approve this rate increase now, especially as the cold winter months are upon us. In my opinion, PSE should have budgeted for their new facility in Tacoma based on current rates, not by price-gouging customers. Sincerely, Richard Brooks
	Mark Hopwood	Web	It feels like they are using their building of new infrastructure to force you to say yes to their rate hike. Either that means the rate hike was already approved or they are kind of using this as a tactic to guilt the commission into approving their rate hike. Also, a rate hike at this time only hurts the community at a time when so many are struggling with the restarting of student loan payments, rising costs of housing and higher interest rates. Now is not the time to cave to their thinly veiled attempts at forcing this huge rate hike.
	Morena Sanidad	Web	3.45% increase rate is steep. Seems everything's cost is on the rise, but if we could negotiate with the rising cost of natural gas for residential, it makes a lot of difference overall.
	Patty Mason	Web	I am a single retired person. Gas is my only form of heat. Please take into account us older folks on a limited income. Its hard making ends meet as it is now. Please.
	Samir	Web	PSE continues to make decent profits. There is no reason for them to pass every single cost down to consumers. They need to look at their executive compensations before proposing any hikes or cutting down investments on supply side.
	Kristin Marie Lillegard	Web	They made a bad business decision. It's not our responsibility to pay for it. It's obsoleting them of risk.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kim	Web	I am opposed to any increase or n natural gas to build a facility in Tacoma.
	Keri Bailey-Gregerich	Web	PSE is a private for profit company posting record profits year after year why are we the public being asked to pay for their expansions new building and construction? PSE raises rates every year sometimes twice a year. As consumers we have no choice PSE runs a monopoly and we are rate prisoners. When folks are having to decide whether to eat or have heat it's time to look seriously at private for profit companies that monopolize a necessary resource! Like air & water power should by a public domain entity
	Lisa Lane	Web	The amount of money we pay to PSE each month already is INSANE and it just keeps going up every few months, it seems. The customers should not be paying an additional 3.45% increase on top of what we already pay. The costs for gas and electricity are already so high that people can't afford the costs. Any price increases put an incredible hardship on the people of WA State. NO PRICE INCREASES should be approved to PSE.
	Blake	Web	Docket UG-230393  I am not in favor of an increase of 3.45% to collect the cost incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility. The Puyallup Tribe of Indians are adamantly against this project. If an accident occurred half of the Port of Tacoma would be leveled. Lives lost. I already pay extra on my bill for green energy.  Thank you,  Blake Smith
	S. Howard	Web	Please don't raise rates again! Inflation is hitting everyone hard and any increase always leads to more and more increases when people don't pay attention to them and say something. The bills become a huge burden to those of us with lower income that don't qualify for assistance.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lara- Ashley Monroe	Web	Please stop increasing rates. We cannot afford this. It is criminal. You need to have someone come in and evaluate efficiency. Please stop increasing. We cannot afford this.
	Andrew Rice	Web	Bills are already too high. Please do not allow them to raise charges. Thank you.
	Ariel Devet	Web	I disagree with schedule 141LNG to increase the gas cost. Puget Sound Energy made ~\$50 million operating income as the monopoly in the area. The gas and electric cost is artificially high in comparity with other states. Now they want to charge us more money to build more facility to new customers. If they want to extend their facility in Tacoma for their new customers there. They can ask for regional tax money, or take some loans. Once they build the facility, they can charge new customers money to pay the loans. Also building this facility is a one time effort, why we, the poor voters, have to pay this increase charge forever?

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jeff Strong	Web	<p>Re: UG-230393</p> <p>I write in opposition to Puget Sound Energy’s proposed tariff schedule requested in Docket UG-230393.</p> <p>I object strenuously to this attempt by PSE to burden residential and other non-transportation rate-payers with costs incurred for the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility.</p> <p>The people who are being asked to foot the bill are the same ones who objected to this facility being constructed at all. There remains deep concern among the people of Tacoma and the 28 Northwest tribes who united to oppose the LNG facility. These concerns include the production of climate-damaging gasses, toxic emissions, and the risk to tribal lands, Tacoma’s downtown, and the many residents living nearby.</p> <p>For PSE to forge ahead with this project and then have the audacity to require these very residents who are at risk to also pay the cost is detestable.</p> <p>I urge the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to reject any LNG-related rate increase, especially any that impact the local community.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Rich Remsen	Web	Not in favor of any rate increase.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rosemary Eldred	Web	<p>*This customer left their comment on the CP voicemail and did not specify contact method, so "do not contact" was selected.</p> <p>I am a senior citizen on a very fixed income. When I get through paying my bills I end up with \$153 for food, clothes, medicine, gasoline for the car, etc. Right now I keep the furnace as low as I can and wear two shirts and a sweater and a coat in the house. If it goes up much more I might as well pitch a tent in the backyard. Please consider my request not to raise the rate.</p>
	Jing Ma	Web	We strongly disagree with the proposal rate increase by PSE. The company has already charged high rates and have increased by a lot year.
	Nicole Helgeland	Web	Do not support the rate increase to support costs incurred for construction costs outside this jurisdiction
	Alex Berg	Web	<p>Docket UG-230393</p> <p>Please consider declining request from PSE to increase natural gas rates. It'll impose additional hardship on many residents in our state. The investment costs that PSE is trying to recoup by increasing rates shall be treated as their cost of doing business and not just passed to their captive customers who have no choice of energy providers.</p>
	Michelle Kelling	Web	Its absolutely ridiculous that PSE wants to raise rates. As a lower income customer I have a hard enough time paying my monthly bill and with colder weather quickly approaching Im going to have to practically freeze to death in my house to keep my bill down so I can feed myself. Something different has to be done!!!

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Niki E Quester	Web	Clearly the LNG facility in Tacoma was a bad business decision for PSE. That being said, it is not fair for me to have to pay for their bad decision. Clearly, the UTC should DENY PSE the rate increase. It is the responsibility of the company and their shareholders to absorb the increased cost of the LNG facility!!!
	Brianna Pfeninger	Web	With the costs of EVERYTHING continually rising and stagnate wages, I seriously implore PSE to not raise rates. My gas bill for my furnace has increased year over year. Please do not increase prices, it is already hard enough to survive with things the way they are now.
	Srinath	Web	The company is UNFAIRLY increasing the rates, which is not justified. Please DONT Approve the proposal
	Scott Fiskness	Web	My power bill has nearly doubled in the last two years. I would like an explanation for such an increase. I have called, and no one can explain the increase. You do not need to charge the community more money for your services. All our paychecks have shrunk due to ever increasing taxes and inflation.
	Sara Holzknacht	Web	I would like to comment on docket UG-230393 regarding Puget Sound Energy. It is not within the interest of the ratepayers for PSE to continue and expand LNG or methane gas use given the significant climate impacts associated with it.  The UTC should block PSE from passing on these costs to ratepayers, who did not make the business decision encumbered this debt. PSE should work to draw down its use of methane gas as it moves towards compliance with Washington State's clean energy laws, and should take the cost of the Tacoma LNG terminal construction out of its exorbitant executive pay and corporate profits.  We'll all have to bear the burden of the climate impacts caused by PSE's ongoing failure to move towards carbon neutrality.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	ANDREW SLOAF	Web	So your telling me that the "for profit" entity, PSE, is crying poor about the hit to their profits? They are making money hand over fist. They have a captive audience that generally has NO other option for this kind of service. I'm sorry but this is the cost of doing business. The fact that they are mostly a foreign owned private company should quite frankly not be allowed in the first place. But to require their customers to pay to help them continue to do business is ridiculous. This should be a capital cost that they are responsible for that is planned within their structure. It wasn't a surprise. This is an obviously foreseeable requirement for their ability to service customers that they are charging. This only benefits their stockholders. Not the customers in any way.
	Lakshmi Priya	Web	Already costs are insanely high. A 3.51% rate hike in residential gas rates in just one year is not justified. Why is the recovery from residential highest and commercial all forms, lower than residential. What is the legality in charging residential consumers more than any other consumer. This is unfair.
	Marie West-Johnson	Web	PSE informed me of a rate increase (adjustment) for a LNG facility in Tacoma. We are senior citizens and live on a fixed income. Any increase in rate will make our monthly budget tighter. Please DO NOT increase the rates on low income and senior citizens. We need protection and relief on a fixed income from rising rates. Thank you!

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Manoj	Web	<p>I do not support the rate increase for two reasons</p> <p>1) price of everything is expensive to inflation. Many families stay home to meet day to day expenses. This increase can put significant financial burden on families</p> <p>2) If the current rates will cover the construction cost over a period of time, then this increase is unnecessary. I think current increase is to recover the costs of Tacoma facilities faster, which is not customer centric</p> <p>3) since this increase is to recover Tacoma center costs, Tacoma residents alone should have a price increase. Outside of Tacoma residents should not be held responsible for what they didn't have a choice for</p>
	Kevin Powers	Web	<p>Businesses need to learn how to invest properly so they do not pass demand growth to existing customers. The increased rates need to be consolidated to the newly added lines rates only rates should only increase when lines need to be replaced, updated or installed in regions for all customers to pay the price for growth we may have or may not have approved in the first place is stealing people hard earned money. The rate increases should be optional just like the programs to add funds to those that cannot afford heating bills. Bottom line as a corporation the business needs to assess what is deemed a waste and where can additional growth income come from without always considering just increase rates but what also is ethical and it's unethical for all customers to pay for new lines that do not run or connect to their homes. That's like paying for new appliances you'll never use for yourself or go into your home, unethical.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Angela	Web	I disapprove of the request to increase natural gas rates due to the financial burden this will place on thousands of customers already scraping by with inflation. We reside in an already expensive city and many of us are drowning in unpaid bills. This will only cause harm to customers. Your CEO, Mary Kipp, makes almost \$1M per year and actually has the gall to pass on these necessary business expenses to people who have no choice but to use this service? We do not have any choice who we have providing us with natural gas and we have to heat and power our homes. You already shame us with your gas usage letters that compare us to our neighbors (which is absolutely disgusting btw). Cut Ms. Kipp's salary to cover these expenses. She's made \$4,760,931 since taking on the position in 2019 and it's unethical and cruel that PSE would even ponder the thought of increasing rates before reducing her salary. Most of my peers live paycheck to paycheck, unable to afford homes or starting families due to the burden caused by debts made by these terrible decisions. We can't even afford to go to the doctor with insurance! Unless you want to cause more pain and suffering, people to lose heat and power or go into significant debt, please do the right thing and rescind this ill-conceived request.
	Karissa Palmer	Web	I am NOT in favor of any price hikes as I pay 35.00-40.00 for gas during per month during the summer months. That's just the water heater. The furnace is off. Majority of that is "service fees and Delivery fees" The gas we used was \$9.00. It seems to me they should be recouping their cost for "updating" in the Service fees. This is why they gouge us after all! This is supposed to be a Non profit. 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.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michael Dryden	Web	<p>A new LNG facility!?!? Are you kidding me?  Anything remotely supportive of new fossil fuel development represents either ignorance of humanity's current plight or moral bankruptcy. More likely the latter.  Hike our rates to move as fast as possible to renewables? Sure. Hike our rates to hasten the heating of our planet so you can make more money? Fuck you.</p>
	Mary Schactler	Web	<p>Docket UG-230393:  The company proposes to pass on costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility to residential customers throughout Western Washington, to the tune of a 3.5% increase. At the same time, it proposes no increase to the transportation industry -- which is the primary beneficiary of the LNG facility. This is absurd.  I am strongly opposed.</p>
	Christopher and Emily Patano	Web	<p>PSE is going to gauge its residential customers with this rate increase. They have clearly been lobbied/brokered with by the bulk of the commercial customers. We residential customers, as individuals, have no bargaining power and going to be left paying for improvements that should be paid for primarily out of PSE profits, secondarily out of their biggest consumers of resources (commercial customers) and only LASTLY and minimally by residential customers.  The email sent out by PSE to its residential customers was almost incomprehensible in their desire to obfuscate the impact this would have on residential customers. Only if one suffered through paragraphs of words that were purposefully vague did one get to an example of what the rate impact would . . . only for the reader to discover they used a laughably low monthly current expense to imply our bills would only be a smidge bigger . . . no one has a monthly bill that low. More obfuscation and sleight of hand work on the part of their attorneys and leadership.  You all, the UTC, are the only entity which seems to be charged with looking out for the "little guy". I certainly hope you do your job and push back against this money-hungry persecution of the residential customers who are defenseless in this situation.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jessica Hakanson	Web	<p>In a time when everyone is struggling financially and stretching every penny just to buy food and pay bills, PSE wants to raise rates again. PSE has been sending my family emails comparing us to other houses and informing us of how much every we use and even asked us to participate in some sort of contest to see who could use the least amount of energy during a certain time window with zero incentive. PSE wants us to reduce the energy we use (that we already pay a lot for) AND wants us to pay more for said energy. We are already trying to keep our energy use down as it is, yet the options of many families will be to be cold during cold months or hot during hot months because they can already barely afford to heat their homes. Stop asking for the struggling families to pay more money just to live in their homes and consider reducing the pay of some of the higher paid positions in your company. We can barely afford to get by as it is.</p>
	Carl Brotherton	Web	<p>Comments typed verbatim by Sam Cooper on customer's call to CP Hotline: I am disabled, on a limited, near-non adjusting income and I have trouble affording current bills.</p>
	Trevor	Web	<p>To even ask this is like a slap in the face to all customers.</p> <p>If I take a peak at your financial statements, net income (after expenses) has increased 46% and natural gas income increased roughly 20+%. The cost of doing business is building and maintaining the infrastructure in place to earn your income. As customers, I think you have a large enough margin to pay for the creation of this plant without asking your customer base to pay for it directly.</p> <p>Shame on you.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	GB	Web	<p>How much attention is paid to tax payers' comments? I am trying to understand WHY a KING County resident should be receiving a higher rate adjustment to support a PIERCE county (Tacoma) costs for construction of Tacoma LNG facility. Also, paying for four miles of pipe - is this in Tacoma/Pierce County also? And the recovery of costs that are not subject to refund - not even sure what this means. Is this attributed to Tacoma also? Explanations should have more transparency!</p> <p>I am against any costs being raised to the tax payers as of right now we live in one of the highest taxes states in the U.S. As far as I am concerned this is just like a tax hike. <b>TOTALLY AGAINST THIS RATE ADJUSTMENT. THEY CHARGE ENOUGH AS IT IS.</b></p>
	Amrutha	Web	
	Agustin	Web	I am not in favor of the new proposal
	Sean barnett	Web	PSE are taking wvantage of their customers,
	Dan Ron	Web	<p>UG-230393</p> <p>I am opposed to PSE's proposal to increase LNG tariffs to pay for construction of the Tacoma LNG terminal. This facility should never have been built, as we are in a climate emergency.</p>
	Matthew Primmer	Web	Increasing utilities costs will further destabilize household financial security. Gas companies are making adequate profits today.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	STEVEN GRAVES	Web	<p>Docket UG-230393</p> <p>PSE has submitted Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment: An overall increase in natural gas rates of 3.45% to collect the costs incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility.</p> <p>I supported the construction of the LNG facility. However, it should be paid for from revenue generated by operation of the plant.</p> <p>Further, there seems to be no provision to rollback the requested 3.45% rate increase once the 'costs incurred' have been recovered by 3.45% rate increase.</p> <p>Please reject this request.</p> <p>Respectfully  Steven Graves</p>
	James Lee	Web	<p>Referencing docket UG-230393 concerning rate increases to pay for a new LNG facility. I don't mind rate increases to pay for pay increases for employees, but there's no world where we should be building new LNG terminals. PSE should be working to de-commission or re-purpose existing natural gas infrastructure, not build new. The new state energy code will reduce the need for natural gas in new buildings, so demand in coming years should be flat or even fall. Plus, from an environmental standpoint, it makes no sense for us to invest in new capacity. This rate increase should not happen because the project it purports to pay for should not happen.</p>
	Josh D Miller	Web	<p>I already pay too much for energy in Washington.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	William Smith	Web	<p>The online form may not have worked - redoing.</p> <p>I oppose (Dock UG-230039) Adj Nat Gas Tariff Schedule. It is not equitable and unfairly harms those of less income. Already under assault from inflation the the absurdly high gasoline costs due to the carbon tax. All of this to make the rich feel better about what they supposedly are doing to damage the climate. Those the cannot afford to pay, will get the short end of this rate change. I oppose.</p> <p>Thanks for your time,</p> <p>William Smith</p>
	GUNEET SINGH	Web	Not supportive of increased costs or investment in facilities that increase the usage of fossil fuels.
	Rachel Thompson	Web	
	Travis Grine	Web	You all are fucking crooks and already way over charge. This increase is a fucking joke and your company and ALL the politicians in this state that support this bullshit should be fucking ashamed.
	Eda Oberman	Web	PSE wants a rate increase for the building the LNG facility in Tacoma. This facility is not environmentally friendly. The Puyallup tribe was against it. PSE should not get any favors for building it.
	Peter Lamanna	Web	The taxes collected on our utilities should be able to cover the costs incurred. If the commission approves the rate increase, there should be no additional taxes collected along with it. The unending increased taxes has not improved the quality of life in this state at all. In fact there is a direct correlation between tax increases and the failed policies driving them. This needs to stop! Our government needs to start returning our tax dollars especially during these economic times. The well is near dry. Wake up!

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Gregory Semerdjian	Web	<p>I am opposed to PSE raising natural gas rates at this time. Many families are already stretched thin with food and other prices and raising the price of heating (especially going into winter), is morally bankrupt to say the least.</p> <p>Please reject this rate increase request.</p>
	Andrea Kristof	Web	<p>As a Puget Sound Energy customer we vehemently oppose PSE’s proposed Schedule 141LNG Rate Adjustment, Schedule 141D Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recovery Adjustment and Schedule 141N Rate Adjustment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The LNG plant’s construction and future operations should NOT be paid for by PSE customers and state taxpayers.</p> <p>We implore you to deny the propose adjustments included in Docket UG-230393.</p>
	Robert	Web	<p>PSE already collects ridiculous amounts of revenue. Plans like this should be built into a business plan like any other business, expecting everyone to do this vs reducing their profits is predatory and unethical.</p>
	Shannon Wright	Web	<p>Absolutely not. In this economy?? We already have some of the highest rates. PSE can take their money grabbing antics and shove it.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Judith Andrews	Web	I disagree with the rate increase. Customers are paying for the work that PSE chose to do. Residential customers are having a much larger increase than commercial customers who have more money than residential customers.
	Stephen T Atkinson	Web	This is highway robbery. I pay the more in gas than I do in electricity and I only use gas for my water heater. I use electricity for everything else. My gas bill should be no more than \$20, but instead it's almost \$50. Im seriously considering getting a bunch of electric tankless water heaters. It would cost less.
	Akram Mellice	Web	I'm absolutely against any increase in rates that incurred while developing the Tacoma LNG Facility. Companies should use their profits to build and develop not simply suggest a permanent rate increase.
	Eric Pennington	Web	If the intent of this "cap and trade" program is to raise taxes on carbon producing businesses, their fee rate increases should be denied. It's supposed to cut into their profits right? Jay Inslee and his cronies pitched this cap and trade crap as if it wouldn't raise prices for us. You can help keep that promise, even if they didn't.
	Ms Carter	Web	People cannot afford to feed their families. Student loan repayment is starting this month. NO ONE is getting raises with the greedflation and you want to raise rates??! We cannot even afford to pay down our PSE bill with it being a WHOPPING \$300+ per month for a 1,600 sqf home and I make sure lights are off and the heat is at the bare minimum. I hope this does not pass. You should be ashamed of yourselves. How greedy can you possibly get?? When people cannot afford their bills and end up homeless you're going to have a hell of a time charging them for heat and electricity.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Angelica	Web	The justification PSE had provided for increaaing residential rates to cover its own costs for for development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG facility is absurd. The residents of the area should NOT be burded for a commercial facility. If the transportation rate is expected to increase of 85.05% in sales, they should being using profits from the sale to fund this, instead of impacting residents.
	Daniel Whitehouse	Web	Docket UG-230393 I am against having them raise rate. The rates are already too high.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tim Ryan	Web	<p>This is in relation to docket UG-230393</p> <p>I am not in favor of the PSE's price increases in order to pay for their new Tacoma LNG facility. If PSE didn't have the money to build this facility then maybe they shouldn't have gone through with it but I'm willing to bet they have more than enough funds to support it. Consumers are always told to live within our means. We don't just get to buy or "invest" in something and then turn around and ask that other people help pay for it.</p> <p>What if one of your employees went and "invested" in a new vehicle to help them get to work? Then they turn around asking you for a raise to help pay for it because it was to ensure they get to work on time and perform when you need them to work? You would laugh them out of your office.</p> <p>In this article from 2021 <a href="https://www.knkx.org/environment/2021-11-23/liquefied-natural-gas-plant-in-tacoma-gets-ok-from-state-pollution-board">https://www.knkx.org/environment/2021-11-23/liquefied-natural-gas-plant-in-tacoma-gets-ok-from-state-pollution-board</a></p> <p>You stated that this new facility is to "ensure we serve our customers during the coldest months of the year." sounds like you needed this facility to ensure uninterrupted service. I don't think that it should be funded by a rate increase. When would this rate increase go away anyways? Would we see this dissappear when it is paid for? Would you sign a contract agreeing to it going away once paid for? I doubt it. You are essentially a monopoly. We bought our new house in Granite Falls and didn't have a choice in LNG providers to choose from.</p> <p>so many families are struggling with higher costs from everything. Your service isn't a luxury that people can just stop using. We need hot hater and heating for my family and even with two incomes are seeing our paychecks disappear faster and faster. We can't take all of these prices month after month for everything.</p>
	Vernon Brown	Web	<p>After receiving record profits and chronically underinvesting in necessary infrastructure PSE's request to increase is an insult to consumers and Washington State residents. The consumer should not bear the cost of chronic mismanagement, waste, spoilage, brought on by unqualified and incompetent management.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Eric	Web	PSE needs to seek a different means of funding their that does not impact residential customer rates. Residential customers should in no way be covering the cost of commercial shipping operations through a tax imposed by the utility. The cost should be able to be covered by PSE or paid for by the commercial entities fueling at the facility.
	Gloria Taylor	Web	I feel that my utilities usage (in Seattle) is ALREADY OVERcharged! You should go after the property OWNERS in the Tacoma area! Of course your explanations are NEVER clear and UNDERSTANDABLE! I DON'T WANT TO PAY A PENNY MORE!!
	Kapuanani M McDonald	Web	Taken verbatim by Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: My husband is retired military, and we are being charged \$100 for 64 therms. To much more we will not be able to afford it. We are on a fixed income and our house isn't even that big.
	Yosuke Kanii	Web	This is regarding Docket UG-230393. I am opposing Puget Sound Energy's request to increase natural gas rates. We as citizens are facing increasingly high cost of living through inflation, and the last thing we need to increase price is necessary utilities. From groceries, to haircuts, to rent, the cost of living has increased at dramatic rates that I have not seen before in my life. I ask that the commission closely assess the implications of allowing a rate increase on the citizens of this state. Thank you.
	William T Peters	Web	Taken verbatim by Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: In the past 3 months they raised my rates. I am on a budget plan with PSE, and they keep raising it. This time they hit me with two months of billing one was \$150.00 and the next was 280.00. I am 89 years old, and I feel like they just keep raising rates and it is taking food off my plate.
	Greg Teich	Web	We should not be raising taxes on an inelastic basic necessity as inflation is wreaking havoc. Additional taxes on gas literally will take heat out of peoples homes, during the winter in Seattle.  Can we please have a respite from another tax increase, whether it's under the guise of a rate increase or actually levied by the government—people are hurt all the same.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joseph Mancuso	Web	Reference Docket UG-230393 I am adamant in my opposition to PSE's requested rate increase for residential natural gas customers to pay for PSE's requested rate increase to cover the cost of construction and maintenance of the LNG plant in Tacoma. Our understanding from the beginning of the plant being built that the LNG plant was built to provide an alternative fuel used by the ships using the Port of Tacoma. Why in the world would residential customers who use natural gas for residential use be responsible for reimbursing PSE for any costs associated with of the LNG plant. There is absolutely no benefit to us. I do not recall any mention during the discussion over the building of the LNG plant that residential customers would be paying for the plant and its maintance. There would have been significantly more opposition to the plant if this had been known. PSE reminds me of the managers of ENRON. Arrogant beyond belief.
	Celeste Maris	Web	PSE should recoup the expense of the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility from their shareholders and NOT from their customers. We have repeatedly objected to the project and aren't interested in paying for it!
	Kyler Brandt Farr	Web	Given the climate crisis, we should not be building new oil and gas infrastructure of any kind. For this reason alone, we should not improve rate increases to cover building the new Tacoma LNG Facility because it should not be built in the first place. If there are any rate increases, it should be to help PSE and customers move faster towards clean energy.
	Janice L Taylor	Web	First, if there is a rate increase, all schedules should share equally. As "transportation" is not defined in the notice I received, I will assume that includes Seattle's gas powered buses and garbage trucks. Let Seattle pay for itself. Second, how much of PSE's new infrastructure is being paid out of their pocket, i.e., their cost of doing business and a diminishing of corporate head bonuses and share holder dividends? Customers should not be put on the hook to keep them wealthy. We have no choice from whom we get our gas.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jan Penta	Web	Asking any of your customers to comment seems so disingenuous. You are going to raise the rates. You waste money sending this letter and you waste the customers time to honestly believe that what is said will make any difference. We need the gas, you have all the power. I can only guess this required by law. A waste of everyone's time when the decision has already been made.
	Gayle Naylor	Web	To be honest, the cost of living increases for fixed income seniors and other low income earners continues to march into infinity. Legislators seem to have forgotten they are fiscally responsible for cost increases as are companies like PSE. The proposed increase PSE is suggesting is above the Cost of Living increase of 3.2% for next year. If you have not connected the dots, 3.2% is taxed away for most taxpayers anyway. Decisions to spend money you don't have is outrageous and that is on those companies who abuse their fiscal charge to those who have to pay inflated costs. My humble request is that this increase be eliminated or greatly reduced.
	Travis Weber Jr	Web	I received the below statement from PSE. It is not clarified if the city of Tacoma is the primary benefactor of the Tacoma facility or if this is equally supporting ALL PSE customers. It is also not clarified if this 3.45% is affecting ALL PSE customers. Additionally, will this percentage be removed after the construction and development costs have all been recovered from the constituents?  PSE has requested the following: Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment: An overall increase in natural gas rates of 3.45% to collect the costs incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rosemary Moore	Web	<p>As a Puget Sound Energy customer I vehemently oppose PSE’s proposed Schedule 141LNG Rate Adjustment, Schedule 141D Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recovery Adjustment and Schedule 141N Rate Adjustment. First, LNG production involves climate desecration from when having been fracked and from leakage during transport and use. Second, PSE’s LNG plant in Tacoma was built improperly and illegally and it also fails to honor Puyallup Nation treaty rights that are the law of the United States. Third, the improper building of the LNG plant did not take into account the environmental impacts for the communities (including but not limited to local tribes and schools) that are in the path of the possible blast zone.</p> <p>Fourth, the product of the LNG plant is being shipped overseas, so we will not be the beneficiaries and the distance transported provide more opportunities for leaks and spills, increasing GHG emissions. This will have global repercussions. 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. Why should Washingtonians pay for this naked placement of profits over the environment which will not benefit us?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. I implore you to deny the propose adjustments included in Docket UG-230393.</p>
	lawrence timpe	Web	<p>(Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment)</p> <p>PSE built the LNG plant in Tacoma to sell LNG to shipping vessels, not to support residential and business LNG users. PSE's inability to recoup the cost to construct and manage the LNG plant through sales to shipping vessels, should not be the burden of residential and business LNG users, PSE's financial analysts knew the cost impact of the LNG plant prior to breaking ground. As a residential LNG user, I am a "no" on this request. If WA state is serious about green energy, LNG is not green energy, WA state should not be rewarding additional consumption of LNG</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Bobby Bonner	Web	Enough is enough. The very year companies want to increase taxes and rates. As a working family we're tired of paying tax after tax after tax. People can barely get by and test another company wants to tax the working people. It's time to stop lining the greedy pockets of big corporations and the wealthy while the rest of us working middle class people pay for it. <b>NO MORE TAXES PERIOD!</b>
	Izzy Herrick	Web	We are already being charged another carbon emission tax by PSE that is going into effect soon/ or is already in effect. Inflation has risen and risen since Covid-19 shut down the world. I and my family cannot afford to continue paying for more things. Use the taxes and funds you already get to pay for this stuff and stop making the middle class do it. We are barely getting by as it is.
	Lynn Wilking	Web	Looks to me like the "Transportation" users are not paying a fair share.
	Ruslan Sorochuk	Web	This company keep raising prices while the economy is bad, for the projects that are not necessary. They already keep spending millions on replacing meters, just to have the newest stuff, but would not do anything useful. I leave my thermostat at 68 during winter, and 50 at night, and have to wear bulky clothes, to avoid being bankrupt. I can't afford this heating bill already. I lost my job, and on unemployment.
	Swapnil Gawde	Web	I'm not in favor of the rate increases in schedule 141LNG. The cost is already high, there is no alternative available for us to choose from, and this monopolistic rate increase affects us negatively financially.  Please don't increase rates for essential services.
	Eric Moore	Web	I reject any price increases. We are being taxed/tariffed/levied beyond reason in the State of Washington - find other means of funding besides the taxpayers

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lisa Johnson	Web	Myself and physicians across the state stand with the Puyallup Tribe in opposing PSE's proposed LNG plant in Tacoma. The buildout of fracked gas infrastructure to support marine shipping threatens our health and climate in the PNW. To then add a rate hike to PSE customers to pay for this project is insulting to the citizens of our area. I am strongly opposed to this project and the rate hike proposed to support it. Lisa Johnson, MD
	Bibin Varghese	Web	
	Travis Gigliotti	Web	Do not let PSE increase rates. Tell them to take a hike. All utilities should be not for profit, stop lining the pockets of millionaires and billionaires at the expense of regular people. NO TO PSE RATE INCREASES!!
	Rebecca Lindahl	Web	I am not in favor of a rate increase. I Don't recall being notified before construction that we would have increased rates. Do edmonds rate payers benefit from this facility in Tacoma? I don't get pay raises to compensate for all the rate and price increases in general that I am now responsible for. Thank you for listening.
	Rahim Hirji	Web	I do NOT support the proposed rate increase related to Docket UG-230393
	Alex	Web	Based on the information made available to the public, PSE has not proven that the costs incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility will have a significant impact on PSE's profits or ability to pay fair wages to their employees. Therefore, I do not support the passing on of these costs to customers. Energy is an essential utility for all residents and raising rates as we head into the coldest season of the year will have a significant negative impact on PSE customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	James Greif	Web	PSE INSTALLED THE GAS LINE TO.MY HOUSE IMPROPERLY. THEY NEVER COMPACTED THE MATERIAL THAT THEY PUT IN ON TOP OF THE PSE GAS LINE. I AM ON A FIXED INCOME AND CAN'T AFFORD COST INCREASE AFTER THEY IMPROPERLY INSTALLED THE GAS LINE.
	Tyler Huntley	Web	The amount of increases for PSE's natural gas rates is placing an undue burden on the low and middle class. Low and middle class working people are struggling financially already and now PSE is once again trying to raise the rates of our necessary natural gas. If this passes, it will cause hardship for many, myself included. Please reject the request from PSE.
	Andrew D Nortrup	Web	I'm writing to say that I am opposed to paying a rate increase of 3.8% to fund the construction of a LNG export terminal in Tacoma. I feel strongly that climate change is an clear and increasing danger to our planet and that the first step in fighting it is to stop burning fossil fuels of all kinds. Charging me more money to build infrastructure that will continue to leak and export fossil fuels for decades to come is forcing me to pay for my own destruction.  I oppose subsidizing more climate change.
	Laura Steinmetz	Web	I do not want rate increases.
	Terrie Hansen	Web	Taken verbatim by Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: The government is trying to limit natural gas and now they are raising the price. There have been many increases in the last two years and they don't need any more money.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Liz Vogeli	Web	Taken Verbatim by Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: I read about this increase and thought it wasn't a big deal but it's not about raising just gas rates, I started reading and found it is so PSE can recover costs for construction, development, and operations of the Tacoma LNG facility development through a new Tariff schedule. I think it is abysmal, they should not have built it in the first place, they did not get the correct permits, it was done all wrong, we are going to be paying for this forever. Do not allow them to raise the rates. I do not want to pay for the Tacoma LNG Facility. It was done all wrong.
	Mike	Web	They should NOT raise rates. Is the electricity some how better? There is enough price gouging going on already. Let's not allow any more.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Gary Myers	Web	<p>The residential rate schedule appears to have greater rate increase than the volume customers. The site appears to be located for export via shipping. The business justification and expense appears to be about volume customers. The point is that residential rate payers should not carry any of the capital cost of a plant that is justified on export and volume customers. Capital debt allocation should be proportional to the sector volume over the total volume over a 30 year period. The residential sector rate should be reallocate to expected future residential customers over the 30 years. The residential rate should exclude all interest rate and finance charges and refinance charges. My theory is that this plant was not justified for residential volumes. The profit from volume customers should not rest on residential customer investment. All things considered... if the above components of rate calculations result in a small rate... the rate should be zero. Residential sector should be credited for the benefit of the existing legacy infrastructure. Exported volumes should be charged to recover the legacy investments that enable transport to the plant. This is not true for local industry that have contributed to legacy infrastructure and contribute to the local economy. The residential sector has rights to late commer fees from export. If the long is a storage for expanding transportation... the residential rates should reflect only operational cost recovery... and only to the degree that the storage is necessary to avoid system transport capacity failure. Do not mis allocate system capacity remedies. Such costs should not exceed other ground storage capital debt allocations to residential customers.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ryan Del Rosario	Web	<p>Regarding Docket UG-230393. Please note my comment may be a duplicate as I failed to include the docket ID in my previous submission.</p> <p>Recently, PSE, announced a series of rate hikes. I understand their CEO has said these hikes are to target having cleaner sources of energy. While I fully support clean energy as a matter of not only social policy but also national security, I must also consider the rate hike and it's affect on my community and my family.</p> <p>It seems everything has gone up in price lately. For the average Pierce County resident, simply living (read: paying rent, utilities, food costs) has become significantly more challenging in the last two years. For certain luxuries, I agree we may just need to tighten belts. But for something as basic and necessary as heat in the winter and the utilities it takes to keep families safe &amp; sound, it seems frankly morally unconscionable to increase rates at this time. This proposed hike comes after a series of price hikes in recent years that have in my estimation, surpassed any kind of similar increases in median or average salaries locally. We wonder why Tacoma and Seattle are seeing increases in people facing homelessness and food insecurity but then say "that's just the way it is" when it comes to asking for increasingly larger slices of folks' income. This decision is a choice and if you support it, I hope you think about this the next time you see someone out in the cold this winter.</p> <p>Not to mention, UTC policy prevents any sense of transparency due to insulting policy "preventing" (read: saving) PSE from noting these hikes on bills and so fellow customers probably won't even fully understand why their bill went up.</p> <p>I fully expect to be disappointed when seeing the result of the comment period. PSE is a private company that has been given monopoly over a huge swath of utility customers in the region and thus I'm sure the expectation for customers is to just go ahead and take it and say "thank you may I have some more". If any of those who have a say in this matter have a heart bigger than their wallets, I implore you to reconsider a rate hike until the economic situation for our county has improved.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joseph Roppo	Web	Taken verbatim by Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: I think Puget Sound Energy is greedy and we keep paying and paying all the time. I moved from Seattle to Tukwila years ago and the rates doubled then. I think it is unfair the Puget Sound Energy is our only option, and they just keep raising prices. I think the company made 208 million in 2021, and 500 million in 2023. I don't think they need to raise any more prices.
	Brett	Web	Why should the customers of this large company help foot the bill for something PSE wants to help them make profits. I have been against LNG ever since they started to and successfully rammed it down the throats of all their customers. The company is not worried about the risks all they see is profit.
	Kathleen W Forman	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy is a privately owned business more dedicated to its ownership group and stockholders than it is to its customers. PSE already charges higher rates for its gas and electricity than other utilities in the state of Washington. PSE, for years, depended on out-of-state coal-burning plants for its electrical energy and is now choosing to go big with natural gas - one of the most harmful greenhouse gases.</p> <p>As a utility, PSE's ethics stand in question - it started construction on the Tacoma LNG Facility before all permits were issued and before the Duwamish Tribe had completed its feedback about the danger of running piping through its land due to the frequency of methane leaks.</p> <p>In addition to the above, it spends a great deal of money for lobbyists whose sole objective during the state's legislative season is preventing passage of any bill that threatens PSE's new emphasis on natural gas, even in the face of overwhelming evidence of its harm.</p> <p>PSE shouldn't be allowed to raise rates. It has money of its own that could be diverted to cover its costs. Instead, it should be forced to decrease its dependence on fossil fuels and invest a whole lot more in sustainable sources of energy. We are facing an actual climate crisis in about 5 years (See Seattle Times 10-31-2023). This is NOT the time to give any utility a go-ahead for more fossil fuel production or greedy profiteering.</p> <p>Please deny PSE's request!!!</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Brittney Thornton	Web	<p>The increase to customer's energy bills with NO explanation is dispicable. At a time when the biggest companies in our state are laying off workers by the thousands, inflation is high, interest rates are high, and the cost of living is the highest it's ever been, this is a ridiculous attempt to keep profit margins for the wealthiest while the rest of us scrape by. PSE is plainly a monopoly for energy service, the fact that they are allowed to function as so is alarming at best. Now you're forcing residents into higher bills because the company needs to adjust to renewable energy, but wealthy leadership can't imagine a profit loss. This rate hike is disgusting and shows how little the utc cares about it's constituents.</p>
	Ira Astrachan	Web	<p>REF: DOCKET - UG-230393</p> <p>I am absolutely against an increase in an ALREADY ridiculous price for natural gas. PSE regularly changes the cost of gas per season, so that in winter the rates go up, costing consumers more than it reasonably should.</p> <p>The proposed tariff schedule is allegedly to "recover costs incurred for the development, construction, and operation " of a new LNG facility in Tacoma. How about this: Have the consumers in the surrounding area pay for it, like what is happening in Kittitas County where residents who opt for natural gas service pay a "New Customer Charge" on TOP of their cost for gas - essentially doubling the cost of our gas - for TWENTY-ONE YEARS so that PSE can "recover the costs involved with extending service to this area".</p> <p>Sorry but the proposed tariff is too much to bear for strapped Kittitas County residents who already feel like we are being taken advantage of by the monopoly that is the "gas company".</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michael Simon	Web	PSE should not be allowed to raise rates again this year. They're already making huge profits, and raised their rates in 2021. Amid huge price increases for fuel and groceries, households do not need any additional expenses, especially from a company that is already profiting so much on an industry with no competition.
	Greg Kruchinin	Web	Please stop letting PSE hike rates to recoup money they spend. Cost of doing business should not be a consumer repayment. Bills are already expensive for everyone but rich people and it's going to get cold. Enough is enough.
	Ted Richardson	Web	First, I am not at all in favor of there being a new LNG plant in Tacoma. We need to solve climate change, not exacerbate it! And second, PSE recently let us know they are proposing to raise rates in order to pay of the new LNG plant. This is the opposite of democracy. After years of public activism in protest of the plant, PSE now wants us to pay for it. How is that just? We don't want it in the first place, don't make us pay for it.
	Andy McCauley	Web	Docket UG-230393)  The rates have continued to go up since I have lived in this state and the service does not change. If PSE continues to increase rates people will leave WA just like whats happening in CA and PSE will lose more money in the end. I stopped using my has fire place because of the rate increase. It used to be cheaper to ise gas than electricity everywhere I have ever lived but this state! PSE needs to be more fiscally responsible instead of increasing rates again
	Christopher Tesar	Web	I am not in favor of PSE's proposed natural gas rate adjustment pertaining to their requesting a new natural gas tariff schedule for the development, construction, and operation of a new LNG facility. These costs should be coming out of PSE's existing capital and operating budgets and not passed on to consumers.
	Nancy Hausauer	Web	I am submitting a comment on Puget Sound Energy's LNG rate adjustment request.  As a consumer/customer of PSE I am adamantly against a rate increase, which, as they say in their

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

notice to customers "will allow PSE to recover the costs incurred for the development, construction and operations of the Tacoma LNG Facility through a new tariff schedule."

I am opposed to it for the following reasons:

The Tacoma LNG Facility was built despite extensive protest from Tacoma residents.

Much of the facility was built before the permitting was even complete. This speaks to me of corruption--they knew they were going to get approved, probably because they bribed influential people.

The Tacoma LNG Facility does not primarily serve Tacoma residents. The methane held in it is primarily for export. The demand for LNG is falling steeply, so the PSE LNG Plant will not even contribute much to our city's tax base.

The Tacoma LNG Facility siting makes it an extreme hazard to many many residents, including the Puyallup Tribe and the Northwest Detention Center. This 8 million gallon tank has a ten-plus mile incineration zone, There are guidelines about siting LNG facilities, and PSE violated those guidelines --and public officials went along with it.

As I understand it, the Puyallup Tribe was not consulted and did not agree to the Tacoma LNG Plant.

With its deep pockets, PSE distributed many forms of propaganda to the public, untruthfully convincing (AKA lying to) residents that liquid natural gas is "safe and clean." It is not. As we have seen from many pipe explosions in many places, it is a danger to residents, a catastrophe just waiting to happen. It is also a fossil fuel that contributes hugely to atmospheric carbon/planetary warming and has become one of the primary targets for eradication in the fight to reverse climate change.

PSE is not even an American company!

Why should local residents have to pay for an LNG plant we did not want, that is dangerous to us, that gives us very little if any benefit? It is adding insult to injury to make us pay for something

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>that hurts us.</p> <p>Our local officials failed us by letting this LNG plant be built. Please don't fail us more by allowing PSE to make us pay for their hated LNG plant.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Richard A.I Glucksman	Web	<p>I believe PSE should not be granted the increase requested based on the current energy costs. We as consumers are paying much higher rates as it and an additional increase only makes things worse for the consumer. I believe PSE should work within their budge to accomplish any improvements they desire in the same fashion that homeowner have to work within the monthly budget to accomplish any improvements to their homes or lives.</p>
	Wuyang Chen	Web	<p>We strongly disagree with the proposed rate increase by PSE. The company has already charged high rates and have increased by a lot in previous years.</p>
	Rick Edel	Web	<p>Why in the hell should we rate payers be held responsible and charged so PSE can recover costs incurred for the development, construction and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility. The utility should use its profits instead of returning them to investors and overpaying its executives.</p>
	Cathryn Waggoner-Ressell	Web	<p>Raising the public's payment is unfair. PSE did a thing and is now trying to have the consumer pay for it instead of paying for it with the funds they already have. That's like taking out a loan and having your mom pay it off for you. No. There is no alternative for consumers for energy in WA and PSE should be responsible when trying to raise payments in an economy where most people are barely making it.</p>
	K John	Web	
	Spencer	Web	<p>Hello, I am submitting a comment <b>STRONGLY AGAINST</b> Docket UG-230393.</p> <p>It was shocking to be notified of this potential increase as me and many others are already battling record high interest rates, out of control inflation, and student loan payments resuming. I just cannot understand why now is the right time for a rate increase. If anything rates should be lowered for essential services to give room for the consumer to breathe.</p> <p>Thank you.  -Spencer</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Patricia Beard	Web	Thank you for allowing me to comment. I encourage you to vote no on PSE's requested general rate hike for the facility developed in the Tideflats constructed to serve TOTE Maritime. This is just the latest in PSE's after-the-fact attempts to get a rate hike for a capital project they already completed. This utility needs to be better managed; project financing should be figured out before the fact and be transparent. I'm glad TOTE has changed to cleaner fuel, but I don't see why residential PSE customers should have to pay the capital costs for that switch.
	Yara Reese	Web	We can't get hit with another increase they need to look for other ways to subsidized for this the percentage increase it's too high considering what families pay during the winter and it will just keep go up.
	Jiayuan Yu	Web	I am referring to Docket UG-230393
	Joy Hickman	Web	In order to ascertain if increase in fee schedule for PSE is justified a thorough review of their profit margins would need to be done. In this time it is quite normal for the profit margins to continue to widen for the same services rendered. While it may be possible that a readjustment is needed, prudence would call for a review of the profits made by the increase before increasing the load for an already strapped population going into the winter season. We are counting on Washington to protect its citizens from predatory company practices and hope this increase request will be deeply examined and weighed against the real costs that will come to its consumers. Thank you for caring for us.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Scott Smith	Web	<p>Docket UG-230393</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule 141D Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recovery Adjustment:</li> </ul> <p>I am not in favor of anything that lets people's bills go up 85%+  That is completely ridiculous and will stretch many peoples budget!  Come back with a reasonable proposal, with clear language and much lower cap on "potential" rate increases.</p> <p>One transportation rate schedule will see a rate increase of 85.05%</p>
	Zhijun Liu	Web	<p>Why are we constructing an inbound LNG terminal in Puget Sound in 2023? This is absolutely nuts. The amount of surplus natural gas in the US that can be shipped around by pipeline is enormous. According to the US EIA, we are producing nearly 400 billion cubic feet above the five year average. <a href="https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/weekly/archivenew_ngwu/2023/06_29/">https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/weekly/archivenew_ngwu/2023/06_29/</a></p> <p>Natural gas from the United States is abundant and cheap. Natural gas on the worldwide spot market is expensive and spoken for.</p> <p>Talk to me about how you are going to build an outbound terminal</p>
	Sam Skidmore	Web	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to PSE's proposed natural gas increase related to the costs of their Tacoma LNG terminal. This terminal was built as a for profit investment by PSE and does not benefit PSE's ratepayers in any way. Asking ratepayers to foot any portion of the bill for this investment is absurd. Construction of this terminal was an optional investment choice made by a private for profit business and whether or not it is profitable is beyond the scope of concern for either the WUTC or PSE's ratepayers.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robert Dickensheets	Web	<p>RE: UG-230393</p> <p>I wish to bitterly complain about the proposed rate increase to the natural gas rates for the PSE natural gas customers. PSE has a notorious history of adjusting their gas and delivery rates to provide them with a maximum profit margin. Now they want the subscribers to pay for the construction of the Tacoma LNG terminal.</p> <p>Any and all construction of any new facilities by PSE should come from their present and past excessive profit margin. The Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission should protect the public from this kind of unqualified burden on our gas rates.</p> <p>PSE past history of adjusting higher delivery rates to compensate for lower gas rates to increase their profit is a gross action. In addition their gas rate is always higher than the market rate at the time.</p> <p>Sincerely, R W Dickensheets</p>
	LISA Lyon	Web	<p>Docket UG-230393</p> <p>I already have to spend 360 to 400 to heat my house in the winter. Increasing the prices, especially in this economy, is ridiculous. I'm in favor of reducing the current price because it's insane that I already have to pay that price to have my home at a livable temperate in the wintertime</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Heather	Web	Seriously?!!! Rates in WA have gotten out of control especially when rates go up multiple times in ONE year. We keep our house at 60F during winter while we sleep and 62-63 during the day. There's not much more we can do to keep our bills down and be eco conscious. We've lived here almost eight years and in that time the rates have skyrocketed. We had been paying \$120 max per month during winter and now it's easily \$250-300/ month while it's cold. We haven't changed anything about our usage. Add to that job losses for so many families and you've created unaffordable living. Everything is going up except people's salaries. It has to stop. This year alone we've had TWO rate increases in electricity, natural gas, garbage, AND water. It has to stop.
	JOSEPHAT ONDIEKI	Web	The proposed increase is will increase the expense burden on the consumers who are not getting pay increases at their work. I do NOT want the increase on the fee. PSE makes enough profits and should think to reallocate it's revenue to cover their expansion costs. Don't transfer the burden to consumers. It's greedy, and it's unfair.
	Thang Dao	Web	The largest amount of SSA increased last year does not cover enough for the differences of the basic needs such as gas, water, sewer, garbage, electric, food. etc... Now PSE want to hike the cost of natural gas which is basic need of every one during the winter for heating. Keep going this way I think the whole country will go bankrupt (not counting those billionaire like Gates or Bezos) special retiree like us. Please asking them companies cut cost by reviewing their internal waste not impose those on consumers. Thank you
	Wilfred P Nelson	Web	Should not construction of the LNG Plant come from company profits since they will be the ones profiting from the facilities use. Saving that, the entire rate increase should be on the shoulder of the companies or entities using the natural gas rather than the public rate payers,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Damon	Web	<p>This customer left their comment on the Consumer Protection hotline. They did not provide their last name or address or specify if contact is acceptable, so "do not contact" was selected.</p> <p>I'm very much against this liquified gas request rate adjustment. I feel it's unreasonable. I feel it's gonna hurt people who are on fixed incomes, like myself and other seniors. We request you turn it down.</p>
	michael jay	Web	<p>I am on a fixed income, a stroke survivor and cannot afford another price increase in my life. All the things that affect lower income families the most such as food, gas, utilities, insurance etc. have increased prices, taxes, and "fees" continuously the past couple of years and it's at a breaking point for us. Please don't hit us again. Thank you for hearing my comment.</p>
	Linda M Jadwin	Web	<p>As we move away from fossil fuels, there should be more emphasis on renewable sources and not natural gas. The state is having builders not use natural gas for heating or cooking purposes. The need will decrease for natural gas. I do not want to pay for a new LNG plant and its pipeline when it has been determined that to save the planet, we need to move to heat pumps and renewable electricity not natural gas.</p>
	Becky Sherley	Web	<p>We are in a time where the cost of everything is at all time highs. Groceries are through the roof, gas prices, power and now they want to increase natural gas. We can not sustain the price of everything going up. Washington state is pricing people out of our state.</p>
	Thu Ngo	Web	<p>I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed rate increases and the prospect of residential customers shouldering the costs of non-regulated, for-profit activities such as the development and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility. It is my firm belief that residential consumers should not be held financially responsible for ventures that are not directly related to essential utility services and are pursued for profit.</p> <p>Firstly, utility rates for residential customers traditionally reflect the costs associated with providing fundamental services such as natural gas, electricity, and water. These rates are</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

structured to ensure that households have access to reliable and affordable essential utilities. When utility companies venture into non-regulated activities for profit, it is unfair and unjust to transfer the financial burden of these endeavors onto ordinary consumers.

Socializing the costs of such ventures places an undue burden on individual households, many of which are already managing tight budgets. Forcing residential customers to bear the costs of for-profit initiatives not only affects their financial stability but also raises questions about the fairness and equity of such a practice. In contrast, these costs should be borne by the company or its stakeholders, who stand to profit from these business ventures.

Moreover, the socialization of costs creates a significant disparity between residential consumers and commercial or industrial clients. Large businesses might benefit from these non-regulated activities without having to share the financial responsibility. This inequity in cost-sharing is neither fair nor justifiable, particularly when individual households, often with limited financial resources, are asked to subsidize these endeavors.

Additionally, it is essential to consider the principle of economic fairness. Charging residential customers for costs incurred in non-regulated, for-profit activities is fundamentally at odds with the principles of economic justice. It places an additional financial burden on individuals and families who may already be struggling to meet their basic needs. This situation raises concerns about income inequality and social justice, as those who can afford it least are asked to pay the most.

In light of these considerations, I respectfully urge the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) to critically evaluate the allocation of expenses related to non-regulated activities such as the Tacoma LNG Facility. The UTC plays a pivotal role in ensuring that utility rates are fair, just, and equitable. I implore the UTC to uphold these principles by preventing the socialization of costs associated with for-profit ventures onto residential consumers.

I believe that it is the responsibility of utility companies to manage the financial risks associated with their business ventures and to ensure that these costs do not disproportionately affect ordinary consumers. By adhering to the principles of fairness, equity, and economic justice, the UTC can safeguard the interests of residential customers, promote social and economic equality, and maintain the trust and integrity of the regulatory process.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. I trust that the UTC will make decisions that reflect the best interests of the residents of Washington State and uphold the principles of fairness and economic justice in utility rate setting.
	Karen Duval	Web	Raising the Transportation rate over 85% is absolutely unreasonable! Gas for vehicles is not going up this steeply! There is absolutely no justification for this kind of increase! We should not have to bear this cost! PSE needs to do a better job at managing their costs instead of putting it on the backs of consumers every time. The cost of everything continues to rise and this request should be denied?
	Ron Morrison	Web	The customer left a voice mail on the Consumer Protection hotline outside of phone hours. The message was heard by Sam Cooper. We (residents of Tacoma) are already paying for it in a sense because we are put at risk by PSE. PSE built its natural gas plant on top of an active earthquake fault. This puts the whole city at risk if we have an earthquake. I oppose this increase because I think they owe us. They're putting us at risk with their plant. On top of an earthquake fault when is known to be active. I strongly oppose this because they shouldn't have built their gas plant on top of an earthquake fault and put us all at risk.
	Frederick Ferreira	Web	Regular consumers should not be responsible for paying for the LNG Facility. It was built mainly to fuel Totem Ocean Trailer Express ships in the Port of Tacoma. Let TOTE pay for the plant. Leave my rates alone. They are high enough.
	Rajendra B. Patel	Web	We're already paying high costs for utilities to include Natural Gas and further raising rates would incur additional financial burdens on us consumers and if the rate increases can be delayed until the economy recovers, that would be good for us. Thank you
	Bill Allister	Web	The proposal states that it is for the cost of a facility in Tacoma. I am not in favor of people paying for a facility that benefits another city and we get nothing.
	Ivan D Hyde	Web	Residents not in Tacoma service area should not bear the cost of the Tacoma LNG facility.  This rate increase is to recover costs. I do not think we should be responsible for PNG being over budget. Additionally, the rate increase request does not have any explanation for PNGs inability to remain within the budgeted amount.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Samantha Del Vecchio	Web	The rate increases are unfair to residential customers who need gas for essential heating in the cold months. Individuals and families don't have extra money to pay for new energy infrastructure in their homes and are stuck paying more and more for utilities. Commercial and industrial customers are charged less per therm under the new bill even though they use a greater volume of natural gas and have options for switching to different energy sources or changing infrastructure to reduce their gas use. Why doesn't PSE raise the average rate per therm for commercial/industrial customers to match what residential customers currently pay and leave it at that?
	Richard Phillips	Web	I think the natural gas rates have been raised enough over the last few years. I have noticed the gas rates have nearly doubled since 2020.  Raising the rates again before winter is not going to be viewed favorably by any customers. We've been hit hard with inflation and the increase in cost per therm has outpaced inflation by a considerable amount.  Please reconsider raising rates again.
	Christopher Secord	Web	I don't understand the rate increase and therefore am not in favor of it. Perhaps it is a failure in messaging and public outreach but why would the construction of a new Tacoma facility result in a rate increase? If there is a capacity issue in the PSE service area then propose a new connection fee increase to bill those new users that the new facility is required for. If this facility is needed to reduce the overall cost of fuel in the long run, then don't increase the rates but also don't lower them until the new facility costs have been recovered. This just seems like building something new because you can and forcing customers who have no free market alternative suppliers to foot the bill.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sadiya and Faheem Khan	Web	<p>I am writing to object to (Docket- UG-230393) a 3.45% increase in natural gas rates that PSE is proposing for residential customers. Since they are a for profit organization, the development of the Tacoma LNG Facility should be a part of their planned investment. I don't see why customers should pay for this with a permanent rate hike. I would be open to a one time fee of upto \$20 to help with their costs, but not a permanent rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you! Sincerely Sadiya and Faheem Khan Redmond, King County</p>
	Aaron Tanczos	Web	<p>I am writing in opposition to raising rates for funding LNG export. The threat posed to us all by global warming should preclude these sorts of activities by utilities.</p>
	Derek Dexheimer	Web	<p>Puget Sound Energy's attempt to establish a new natural gas tariff schedule (Schedule 141LNG – Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment, allowing PSE to recover the costs incurred for the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility) must be denied.</p> <p>Continued fossil fuel development only accelerates biosphere collapse, in addition to enabling fracking in the Pacific Northwest. Fracking is immediately destructive, and biosphere collapse is occurring even faster than the most dire projections. No further fossil fuel development must be allowed. As public stewards, the UTC must deny this request.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ruchin Shah	Web	<p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) to adjust natural gas rates (Docket UG-230393)</p> <p>The rate adjustment outlined in this announcement is outrageous and outright illegal. The profit of these corporations are being put before savings of common man. All these rate hikes are eating into marginal budgets of middle class man. There is no option in Seattle area other than PSE and this causes non competition and monopoly resulting in antitrust</p>
	Marc Smason	Email	<p>i'm very sad that you built this new gas infrastructure when the world is burning from such things!</p> <p>Marc Smason  206-261-6445</p>
	Lori Taylor	Email	<p>Hi</p> <p>I oppose your rate hikes.</p> <p>A former PSE president lives in my neighborhood and is extremely wearily. PSE is very profitable. Gouging your customers just intensifies your corporate greed and utter lack of humanity.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Lori Taylor</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Paul Lee	Email	<p>I oppose this rate adjustment. It is the wrong move to develop infrastructure related to burning fossil fuels particularly in and around Washington State where electricity from sustainable sources is so abundant and cheap in comparison.</p> <p>Paul Lee 206.251.1666</p>
	Jared Mason-Gere	Email	<p>Good morning- please vote no on Puget Sound Energy's requested natural gas rate increases. Natural gas rates have increased dramatically and household budgets are under immense pressure. Now is not the time to ask individual south sound residents and families to subsidize PSE's expenses. They can find the money elsewhere. Look to executive salaries rather than milking the rate payers.</p> <p>Please vote NO and hold rates steady or push them down.</p> <p>Jared Mason-Gere Olympia Washington</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756

**In Favor:** 3

**Opposed:** 747

**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Roger Horne	Email	<p>Just received a notification that the PSE is raising EVERYONE's rates so to pay for a facility in Tacoma. As a user in Lynnwood, how does this new facility benefit me as a customer?</p> <p>If it benefits me I'm willing to have the rates go up to support new infrastructure, but if it doesn't benefit me in Lynnwood why should I help pay for that structure.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Roger Horne</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Cedric Moore Jr. and Felicity Jones	Email	<p>Dear Members of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to Puget Sound Energy's (PSE) request for a 3.45% increase in natural gas rates as outlined in Docket UG-230393. It is concerning that the company seeks to pass on the costs of the development, construction, and operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility to Tacoma residents. Our city is already grappling with a significant burden of housing expenses, and it seems unjust to further stress our residents financially for a facility that is a corporate decision.</p> <p>Furthermore, I'd like to highlight PSE's Q4 2022 Earnings Call to Investors, available online that clearly states "PE/PSE has a manageable debt profile, with strong access to the capital markets and ample liquidity to properly finance the business." This statement casts doubt on the company's assertion that they need to raise rates to cover their operational costs. It indicates that PSE is in a financially robust position, thus making this rate hike questionable. Transparency is vital for maintaining public trust, and at this juncture, PSE's actions seem incongruent with their stated financial health.</p> <p>Lastly, while I recognize that the UTC has the authority to approve rate changes that may be higher or lower than PSE's request, I urge the commission to take into account the collective financial strain already experienced by Tacoma residents. It would be fundamentally unfair to ask us to shoulder the financial responsibility of PSE's new facility. I look forward to participating in the upcoming public hearing and hope the UTC will reconsider the proposed rate adjustment in light of these concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Cedric Moore Jr. and Felicity Jones</p> <p>3022 South 13th Street  Tacoma, WA, 98405  cedricmoorejr23@gmail.com  206-571-4974</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sandra Mayer	Email	<p>Hello</p> <p>I understand that costs may rise due to increassd tariffs or hopefully are lowered</p> <p>I am on a tight budget like many other people and can probably afgord a rate increase</p> <p>However even if my furnace is set at a pretty low temperature I feel my bill is a bit high already</p> <p>Thank you Sandra</p>
	Don Wile	Email	<p>Puget Sound Energy, which is a definite monopoly, is again asking for another price increase. This time for natural gas costs. I am so tired of this utility continuing to request cost increases to the customers. At 84 years of age, it is increasingly difficult to continually having their increases approved by your commission. While my wife and I don't qualify for senior citizen discounts, having to add to our social security monthly income by continually taking funds from our savings, We will most likely need to eventually move into an assisted living facility for which we are trying to maintain our savings to pay those costs. My utilities bills continue to increase every time this utility convinces your commission how needy they are and in most cases you continually appease them with rate increases, with no considering for their customers of all ages who have been hit with increases in basic needs.</p> <p>Please do not allow this Puget Sound Energy increase in natural gas costs to occur!</p> <p>Thank you for your sincere consideration. Don Wile 22771 SE 277th Place Maple Valley, WA 98038</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	David Apps	Email	<p>We're JUST making it these days!</p> <p>Enough is Enough!</p> <p>Thank you for listening</p> <p>David Apps</p>
	Faraz Zarghami	Email	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I'd like to leave a comment regarding the proposed rate filing from Puget Sound Energy (PSE).</p> <p>Seeing as how Puget Sound Energy is Washington State's largest, privately-owned electrical and gas utility provider, with a monopoly franchise for much of Western Washington, I would like to object to the proposed rate increase, especially since PSE produces enough of a profit every quarter/year to more than cover the cost of the proposed rate increase, while still providing ample value to its customers and shareholders by not burdening their average consumers that they serve with increased costs.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration regarding my comment!</p> <p>~Faraz</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tyler Folsom	Email	<p>PSE has defied the mandate to reduce fossil fuel by providing a business plan that envisions maintaining the same levels of natural gas consumption for the next 20 years. Building the Tacoma LNG facility was a poor business decision. It does not serve the public interest. The rate increase should not be permitted. If PSE loses money providing natural gas, maybe it will cross their minds that destroying Earth's human habitability is not a viable option.</p> <p>Tyler Folsom, PhD, PE  5805 16th Ave NE  Seattle, WA 98105</p>
	Jeff Jordan	Email	<p>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.</p> <p>Thank you,  Jeff Jordan  WA 98117</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Margaret Gibson	Email	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>We are in receipt of the notice dated 9/27/23 regarding rate increases and I am floored.</p> <p>We all know that PSE is a PRIVATELY owned company. Instead of funding their own build with a bank loan or profits and their shareholders getting a bit less of a dividend, they are getting us regular folk pay for the new Tacoma LNG facility. And we're supposed to be OK with at?</p> <p>And these increases are using government tax brackets as a guideline, it seems: The wealthy and corporations pay little to no taxes while the burden is placed on us regular, working-class citizens to fund the government.</p> <p>I am old enough to remember that monopolies are still illegal and what PSE is doing to the consumer is horrible.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Margaret Gibson  Monroe, WA</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Christopher Getchell	Email	<p>These constant rate increases from utility providers is more than I can afford. As a 70 year old senior on a fixed income I find myself having to choose between keeping my utilities on and other essential items like food, medicine, clothing, gasoline to get to appointments, etc. It's sad I have to sit in my house with a coat on because I have to keep the heat so low to try and save money.</p> <p>I know there is nothing I or other's can say to avoid these rate increases, it just never stops. With the increase in the cost of food, gasoline and other essential item I see my dollar shrink every day.</p> <p>Please do not increase my gas rates.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Christopher Getchell</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mel Silver	Email	<p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>Yesterday I received in the mail from PSE, notification of their desire of approval to raise monthly pricing of natural gas, pending the WA States UTC approval. Their reasoning is they built the new Tacoma LNG Facility. PSE is now asking for the 3.5+ Rate increase to the customers to absorb the cost.</p> <p>I believe this monthly price increase is unreasonable and these Contruction expenditures are part of doing business. They are asking for this price increase, as customers are having a hard time putting food on their tables. As we live in these inflationary times with the cost of everything going-up.</p> <p>I would ask that the UTC reject PSE's request to raise prices.</p> <p>Yours truly</p> <p>Mel Silver</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	<p>Rev. Canon Marilyn Cornwell, Dr.Robert Cornwell</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>The Rev. Canon Marilyn Cornwell, Ph.D., 206-236-0287  and  Dr. Robert Cornwell, Ph.D., PE., 206-321-6786</p> <p>9010 SE 47th St.  Mercer Island, WA 98040</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	S. Christiansen	Email	<p>I received the notice about the rate increase in Saturday's mail.</p> <p>A few months back PSE raised my cost to cover from \$62 a month and getting back a refund at the end of the year to be \$82 a month and now this additional rate request all while my usage has not changed. This was a rate increase of 132.25%. Please do not sanction another rate at this time.</p> <p>The natural gas expense is less than the Seattle Public Utility charges but that does not warrant or explain the need for a change to consumers. The increase is extraordinarily high as PSE wants to increase it over the 132.25% to consumers. There plan must be rejected. The ideal that residential users should subsidized for businesses is not a good foundation for any consumer. Businesses should not be given discounts at the expense of residential consumers. Those that use the service should pay the same rate and pass the expense onto their product. Penalizing consumers is not a democratic resolution or a valued business practice. It is not promoting businesses when they are not paying their own equal cost of public resources.</p> <p>I am not pleased with the plan and hope it is rejected, again.</p> <p>What are they paying their CEO? Ask them to improve their business model.</p> <p>S. Christiansen  Homeowner</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Richard Phillips	Email	<p>I think the rates have been raised enough over the last few years. I have noticed the gas rates have nearly doubled since 2020.</p> <p>Raising the rates again before winter is not going to be viewed favorably by any customers. We've been hit hard with inflation and the increase in cost per therm has outpaced inflation by a considerable amount.</p> <p>Please reconsider raising rates again.</p>
	Steve Chase	Email	<p>Docket UG-230393</p> <p>I am writing about the requested rate increase for natural gas rate requested by PSE for the proposed Liquefied Natural Gas Facility in Tacoma. LNG plant in Tacoma would be for exporting NG. I do not see why the residential NG rate for NG should be increased for a new business PSE wants to create. The LNG rate PSE charges for export should reflect the cost of building the new LNG facility. The residential rate should not increase for pay for this facility.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Steve Chase</p>
	Kevin Bannon	Email	<p>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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	W. Edwards	Email	<p>What I don't see anywhere is the answer to ratepayers fundamental questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What tangible benefits accrue to the ratepayer if this increase is approved?</li> <li>2) What harms accrue to the ratepayer if this increase is not approved?</li> </ol> <p>Without good, honest answers to these, there is no justification for proposing a rate increase, much less approving it.</p> <p>thank you.</p> <p>W. Edwards, Mukilteo WA.</p>
	Chanel Finnie	Email	<p>I am writing, as a resident of Tacoma, WA; to ask that you please do not raise the natural gas bill. The bill is already high enough and, for those of us who are not doctors or scientists, we don't make a lot of money. Every extra dollar goes towards food or gas. Raising the natural gas price could mean going hungry or not being able to pay for gas to get to work. I beg of you to refrain from raising the price, at this time.</p> <p>Thank you,  Chanel Finnie</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Laurie Wells	Email	<p>PSE included higher profit margins in its proposal than were justified.</p> <p>PSE is asking to increase its profits to nearly 10%, those profits are too high.</p> <p>PSE's request is approximately \$188 million too high over three years for electric rates and \$112 million too high for natural gas rates.</p> <p>What are you trying to do to people? Isn't it enough that EVERYTHING costs more in this state? Do you realize how many people are looking to leave this state because of these and others of the Governors failed policies? Believe me it is far more than you know.</p> <p>Laurie Wells  "God raised Jesus Christ from death and set him on a throne in deep heaven, in charge of running the universe, everything from galaxies to governments, no name and no power exempt from His rule. And not just for the time being, but forever. He is in charge of it all, has the final word on everything. At the center of all this, Christ rules the church. The church, you see, is not peripheral to the world; the world is peripheral to the church. The church is Christ's body, in which he speaks and acts, by which he fills everything with his presence." Ephesians 1:20-23 The Message</p>
	Virginia Gunderson	Email	<p>UTC:  Now is not the time to raise rates. Too many of us are struggling to feed our families. Some are having to choose between medicine and groceries. With winter coming how many will suffer with little or no heat.  NOW IS NOT THE TIME!</p> <p>Virginia Gunderson</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Martin Kreshon	Email	<p>Please deny PSE's requested rate increases. Thank you.</p> <p>-Martin Kreshon</p>
	Kathy McFall-Butler	Email	<p>Regarding Docket UG-230393</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Disregarding public safety, ecology, and possibly the legality of situating this monstrosity on tribal land, PSE forged ahead for profit.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Kathy McFall-Butler</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nicola Moore	Email	<p>I am opposed to the proposed rate increases for Docket UG-230393</p> <p>I am a homeowner at 1368 W Bertona St, Seattle, WA 98119</p> <p>Regards, Nicola Moore</p>
	Paula Sullivan	Email	<p>External Email  <b>COMPLETELY OPPOSE ANY MORE PRICE GAUGING !!</b>  <b>VOTE NO ON INCREASE.</b></p> <p>Snohomish County Consumer</p>
	Jon Dykes	Email	<p>I am not in favor of raising natural gas rates.</p> <p>I feel like these calls should've been communicated before building and doing the projects.</p> <p>PSE is reporting good profits, so I don't feel that it needs to be passed on to the average consumer.</p> <p>This is further hurting the affordability of living.</p> <p>- Jon</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Scott Bonifield	Email	<p>My Comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Community did not ask for it.</li> <li>2. PSE decided on their dime to build it.</li> <li>3. Why should we subsidize their construction projects.</li> <li>4. We are already getting charged for the new carbon tax from the 2021 Climate Commitment Act.</li> <li>5. This is already a 3% Rate hike.</li> <li>6. Families are already struggling due to high inflation.</li> <li>7. Now PSE wants an extra 3.5 %</li> <li>8. This is absurd.</li> </ol> <p>Please Reject this.</p> <p>Thank-you,</p> <p>Scott Bonifield</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Elizabeth M Stoddert	Email	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Elizabeth M Stoddert</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Vicki Lockwood	Email	<p>UTC Commission Members and Public Counsel,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 it's 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p> <p>Vicki Lockwood  4235 S 164 St  SeaTac, Wa 98188</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	LARRY EAGLE	Email	<p>NO NO NO IS OUR RESPONSE</p> <p>NOT WARRANTED AND TOO MUCH OF A HARDSHIP ON SENIORS WITH FIXED INCOMES</p> <p>NOT EVERYBODY NEEDING LIHEAP SSISTANCE QUALIFIES FOR ASSISTANCE, AND THIS WILL FORCE SOME OF US TEETERING ON THE EDGE INTO HOMELESSNESS!!!!</p> <p>LET THEM WORK MORE EFFICIENTLY AND FIND COST SAVINGS</p> <p>A BIG NO TO ANY RATE INCREASE ~~~ ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>LARRY EAGLE  SENIOR &amp; VETERAN</p>
	Jim Barb Gregg	Email	<p>Briefly I will offer my opinion on the ill fated plan of Port of Tacoma,Tacoma,Puget Sound Energy and Shipping Corporation and others involved in the construction of the Tacoma LNG plant and related projects . Here we were at the outset of Covid and I was introduced to a variety of Environmental problems and impacts visa Zoom. To the forefront came background info on The LNG plant on the Port of Tacoma and the objections of the Puyallup Tribe and the support for them by other recognized Environmental institutions. Basically I learned how patient Activists need to be. And how delay tactics and greenwashing can take over. This was a major POOR idea from the start.. Since we have lived in King County our lifetime the majority of our billing for energy has been to the monopoly of Puget Power. I find it ridiculous for them to expect ratepayers to cover for a bogus project. What they put out instead is how they move to green energy. Are they going to ask for rate increases for more wrong way projects?</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robert W Palmer	Email	<p>I am opposed to the increase. Looking at my natural gas bill September 2023 and comparing last year's cost to this year's cost. There was a 13.33% increase.</p> <p>Thank you,  Robert W Palmer</p>
	Bassam Jarjees	Email	<p>I am a resident of Auburn, Washington. I wish to comment about Docket UG-230393.</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposed 3.5% rate changes for natural gas service. This rate increase will be a financial hardship for my family. I only have part-time employment and am trying to support a family of 6. Any rate increase will take away from the money that I can spend on basic needs such as food and clothes for my family.</p> <p>Please do not enact this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Bassam Jarjees  Customer of Puget Sound Energy, currently in good status</p> <p>email: sam33333@yahoo.com</p>
	Peg B Ponack	Email	<p>RE: Docket UG-230393T</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Peg B Ponack, CPA retired
	Vicki Olin	Email	<p>PSE: ABSOLUTELY REFUSE THIS.</p> <p>All you do is gauge us and you can get your funds back from the government in the taxes we pay.</p> <p>THIS IS BS..</p> <p>--</p> <p>Thank You, Vicki Olin 351 Steam Gin Loop, Cle Elum, WA 98922 425-830-6632 VOLIN123@GMAIL.COM</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dorian Zimmerman	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>“Both the science and the policy tell us that greenhouse gas emissions need to immediately begin a sharp trajectory downward, but in this EIS the agency ignored the science and the policy responses...it's like a pack a day smoker, whose been told they need to cut cigarettes or die, declaring everything is fine because they've cut down from 20 cigarettes a day to 19. That is neither an honest or a useful way to look at the problem.”</p> <p>I urge you to listen to these words from attorney Jan Hasselman about the fundamental flaws of the EIS approach to the creation of -- and now increased utility customer financial burden for -- the proposed Tacoma LNG facility.</p> <p>PSE has proven time again in arguments across Washington that its interests are to support its shareholders versus protecting Washington State citizens and customers.</p> <p>LNG makes an already environmentally suspect fossil-fuel product (that is, fracked natural gas) even worse on account of the very real environmental and human health dangers of transport.</p> <p>This investment and the hard-earned money of PSE's utility customers would be far better spent on investments in <i>*actual*</i> clean energy, not greenwashed fossil fuel solutions like LNG.</p> <p>I am not alone in stating that proceeding with this facility will bring down continued exercise of our first amendment rights to protest from other PSE customers, concerned Washingtonians, and local tribes like the Puyallup.</p> <p>Best,  Dorian Zimmerman</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dale Wilson	Email	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>My name is Dale Wilson, I'm a Tukwila resident currently being serviced by PSE for gas and wanted to give my thoughts on the upcoming natural gas rate adjustment.</p> <p>Based on the port of Tacoma's website, it seems like this adjusted rate is being proposed to offset the construction of a new LNG facility.</p> <p>This facility's purpose is to provide local transportation companies with a cleaner fuel alternative and have "reserves" during winter.</p> <p>I don't understand why it's being considered to pass the cost of this facility to homeowners at all.</p> <p>Is there something I'm missing?</p> <p>If the main goal of the facilities is to provide fuel for shipping companies, don't see why the cost of their facility needs to be passed along to residential buyers.</p> <p>Please reject their proposal for the increased tariff schedule.</p> <p>As a homeowner, I'm seeing every one of my utilities increase this year and it's starting to get ridiculous.</p> <p>Best, Dale</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Peggy Printz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all.  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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs related to fracking: poisoned water tables; earthquakes; destruction of habitat.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Peggy Printz  peggyjprintz@gmail.com  7729 57th Avenue NE  Seattle, Washington 98115</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Brian Thayer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>
--	--------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Brian Thayer sold@brianthayer.com 7525 28th St W University Place, Washington 98466</p>
	Tony Smith	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>Many residents and voters including myself were and are against the LNG project in Tacoma. We should not be forced to cover the costs of this unwanted project.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Tony Smith  
smithantonio@live.com  
7408 20th St W  
University Place, Washington 98466



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Kyle McElheran	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>
--	----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Kyle McElheran McElheranL@Gmail.com 11005 63rd Ave NW Gig Harbor, Washington 98332</p>
	Sunny Thompson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Sunny Thompson  
sunny@wellspringspa.com  
54922 KERNAHAN ROAD E  
ASHFORD, Washington 98304

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

pat milliren	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          pat milliren          patmilliren@gmail.com          w. 8th street          port angeles, Washington 98363</p>
	Sumner Peterson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Sumner Peterson  sumnerpeterson@gmail.com  1605 N Visscher St O-203  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Joe Wiederhold	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Joe Wiederhold  jwiederhold47@gmail.com  1405 Edwards St  Bellingham, Washington 98229</p>
	SHAINA Kilpatrick	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
SHAINA Kilpatrick  
skilpatrick03@gmail.com  
1122 s Highland Ave, 117  
Tacoma, Washington 98465



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Janet Regier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	--------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Janet Regier          jeregier@gmail.com          418 Del Monte Ave          Fircrest. WA, Washington 98466</p>
	Linda Phillips	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Linda Phillips  linlee41@yahoo.com  7021 South Junett  Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	Annie Mitchell	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Annie Mitchell  
ilsaycia@gmail.com  
4023 S. Lawrence Street, Apt. #322  
Tacoma, Washington 98409

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Rita Glasscock	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Rita Glasscock          ritalink9@gmail.com          1200 Camino Consuelo          Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507</p>
	Justin Hentges	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Justin Hentges  hentgesjd@gmail.com  3328 N Baltimore St  Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	Paula Gordinier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Paula Gordinier  pgordi2@gmail.com  590 Wimbledon CT  Eugene, Oregon 97401</p>
	nancy corr	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  We should NOT support any more fossil fuel projects !  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
nancy corr  
CORRnancy03@gmail.com  
816 S 216th #608

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			des moines, Washington 98198
	Darcy Skarada	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Darcy Skarada          dskarada@gmail.com          10976 Rosa Trail          Kelseyville, California 95451</p>
	Joan Vaux	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Joan Vaux  vauxjoan394@gmail.com  612 S Division Lane  Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
	Jared Howe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jared Howe  
jaredchowe@gmail.com  
4107 MLK Jr Way S  
Seattle, Washington 98108

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Glenn Panameno	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Glenn Panameno          agentpaper47@gmail.com          211 S 55th St          Tacoma, Washington 98408</p>
	<p>Christina Manetti</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Christina Manetti  krysiulek@gmail.com  6925 Hillgrove Lane SW  Lakewood, Washington 98499</p>
	Tracy Ouellette	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Tracy Ouellette        tracyjouellette@gmail.com        14078 Mactaggart Ave.        Bow, Washington 98232</p>
	Ailsa Wallerich-Neils	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Ailsa Wallerich-Neils          meangoodbye@hotmail.com          3601 S Gunnison St          Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	<p>Laura Schleyer</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Laura Schleyer  lauraschleyer@gmail.com  303 Wilson St NE  Olympia, Washington 98506</p>
	<p>William McPherson</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  William McPherson  wrmcpherson@gmail.com  2728 FAIRVIEW AVE E  Seattle, Washington 98102</p>
	Kevin Gallagher	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes the lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in its deliberations. 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 human health costs related to these events. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction, and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Kevin Gallagher  
kevingal@uw.edu  
15866 36th Avenue NE  
Lake Forest Park, Washington 98155

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Melissa Brechbiel	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	-------------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Melissa Brechbiel  melbrechbiel@gmail.com  6613 South Monroe Street  Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	<p>Alex LeBaron</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Alex LeBaron  alex.c.lebaron@gmail.com  5847 South Lawrence Street  Tacoma, Washington 98409-5321</p>
	<p>Dr. Lauri Lindquist</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Dr. Lauri Lindquist        llindqu@tacoma.k12.wa.us        4328 S Park Ave        TACOMA, Washington 98418</p>
	Zan Lussier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Zan Lussier  
zanarama@gmail.com  
1120 Cliff Avenue, Apt 206

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Tacoma, Washington 98402
	ANNA WILBANKS	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  ANNA WILBANKS  tanbabygirl@yahoo.com  S MONTGOMERY ST  TACOMA, Washington 98409</p>
	<p>cheryl waitkevich</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  cheryl waitkevich  cwaitkevich@gmail.com  2027 Bethel St NE  Olympia, Washington 98506</p>
	Alex Fay	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Alex Fay  
alexafpfay@gmail.com  
1819 23rd Ave Apt E220  
Seattle, Washington 98122

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Robb Krehbiel	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	---------------	-------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Robb Krehbiel robb.krehbiel@gmail.com 7521 East E Street, East E Street Tacoma, Washington 98404</p>
	Donald Evans	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Donald Evans  don.evans.jr@gmail.com  4052 S 31st street Apt# 3  Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	Scott Woll	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Scott Woll  
nwascottwoll@gmail.com  
4410 35th street ct ne  
Tacoma, Saint Croix Island Wa. 98422

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Carrie McKee	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Carrie McKee  mcmckee11@gmail.com  4413 N 21st St  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	<p>Breana Melvin</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Breana Melvin  bre.melvin@gmail.com  1427 East Morton Street  Tacoma, Washington 98404</p>
	Gill Fahrenwald	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Gill Fahrenwald  
anvilman@orcalink.com  
PO Box 2323  
Olympia, Washington 98507

Felicity Devlin

Email

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  Felicity Devlin  felicitydevlin@yahoo.com  2417 N Washington  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Gordon Wheat	Email	<p>PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. This is not fair and not good climate policy!  PSE claims the facility will provide cleaner fuel for marine shipping, but studies show that Liquefied Natural Gas is just as bad for climate as other marine bunker fuels when lifecycle emissions are counted.</p> <p>Even if LNG were cleaner, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be borne by residential customers. Residential customers would only use approximately 2% of the gas from the facility, yet are being asked to pay for 43% of the construction costs.</p> <p>Communities in the PSE customer base are actively working to convert all new and existing residential construction to efficient heat pump technology. There is no need for this "backup" natural gas supply. This is just an excuse to get residential ratepayers to foot the cost of this facility that serves no interest other than PSE shareholders.</p> <p>This was a horrible plan from the beginning, and the burden of this bad decision should be borne by PSE alone, not residential ratepayers!</p> <p>Gordon Wheat  Olympia, WA  PSE ratepayer</p>
	Luann Hendricks	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          Luann Hendricks          lkphnbc@yahoo.com          2108 N 26th st          Tacoma, Washington 98403</p>
	<p>Victoria Poling</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Victoria Poling vpoling@gmail.com 13243 SE 276th ST Kent, Washington 98042</p>
	Marti Lambert	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Citizens have been opposed to this boondoggle for years now! Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Marti Lambert  
martilambert2@gmail.com  
413 Farallone Avr  
Fircrest, Washington 98466

	Lucinda Stroud	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,
--	----------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  Lucinda Stroud  lucinda.stroud@gmail.com  225 W Olympic Pl #109  Seattle, Washington 98119</p>
	<p>Jack Stansfield</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Jack Stansfield          jstansfield8981@gmail.com          16314 62nd Ave. NW          Stanwood, Washington 98292</p>
	Saiyare Refaei	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Saiyare Refaei  SAIYARE.REFAEI@GMAIL.COM  7502 s Park ave  Tacoma, Washington 98408</p>
	Margaret Berger	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Margaret Berger  
MargaretRBerger@gmail.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			5015a 37th Ave S Seattle, Washington 98118-1903
	Valerie Middleton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Valerie Middleton  valerieRmiddleton@gmail.com  802 S Cushman Ave  Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Kristiana Lapo</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Kristiana Lapo  kristiana.lapo@gmail.com  804 32nd St, Apt 8  Bellingham, Washington 98225</p>
	Alyssa Parker	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Alyssa Parker  
alyssa\_prkr619@yahoo.com  
235 Broadway  
Tacoma, Washington 98402

Adam Houston

Email

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  Adam Houston  adambhouston@gmail.com  2900 Fuhrman Ave E  Seattle , Washington 98115</p>
	<p>Sue Lepore</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Sue Lepore  suelepore53@gmail.com  3918 N Defiance St  Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	Janeen Provaz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Janeen Provazek  
provaj@hotmail.com  
1117 N 7 St  
Tacoma, Washington 98403

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Steven neshyba	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Outrageously, irresponsibly, but predictably, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is asking for a rate increase to cover costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. It should not receive that approval.  Steven neshyba  nesh@pugetsound.edu  1515 N. Prospect St.  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Mara Henderson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Mara Henderson  henderson.mara98@gmail.com  1914 N Lawrence  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Katheryn Ridgley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Katheryn Ridgley  katherynridgley@gmail.com  6027 S PUGET SOUND AVE  TACOMA, Washington 98409</p>
	David McInturff	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , I was not in favor of this LNG project to begin with. It was falsely advertised as an effort towards

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

"going green". The project does not move us closer to reducing fossil fuel impacts and it can credibly be argued to be a step backwards. Now, the Tacoma area is saddled with more fossil fuel infrastructure that we cannot walk back. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. David McInturff mcntrff@gmail.com 4705 Memory Lane West University Place, Washington 98466</p>
	Roxy Murray	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Roxy Murray  atouchofwanderlust@gmail.com  5313 N. 39th St.  Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	austin paul	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
austin paul  
2892903@gmail.com  
850 arcadia w  
port townsend, Washington 98368

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Ann Dorsey	Email	<p>Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I urge you to deny Puget Sound Energy's (PSE) request to raise residential customer rates to pay for the construction costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas facility for the reasons below:</p> <p>PSE wants to raise residential gas rates by 3.45% when it is already Washington's most expensive utility and many customers are struggling or unable to pay their bills.</p> <p>PSE has not proven that large projects like the Tacoma LNG refinery are a prudent investment for ratepayers.</p> <p>Customers would pay off the massive costs of fossil fuel infrastructure projects over many decades. To meet Washington's climate targets, new fossil fuel projects will need to be retired well before they are paid off—potentially leaving customers on the hook for huge costs that they never benefit from.</p> <p>PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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.</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.</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.</p> <p>o Even if LNG was cleaner, the cost of cleaning up the shipping industry should not be borne by residential customers. Residential customers would only use approximately 2% of the use of the facility, yet are being asked to pay for 43% of the construction costs.</p> <p>This facility is predicated on PSE's false assertion that public demand for natural gas will increase. This assumption ignores the reality of growing public demand for electric heat pumps instead of</p>
------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>gas heating, and both state and local government regulations moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</p> <p>When examining what constitutes lowest cost, I urge the Utilities and Transportation Commission to start including more than just the upfront financial cost in their deliberations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o 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.</li><li>o When approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas, 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.</li></ul> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Ann Dorsey</p>
	Penny Rowe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is a blatant abuse of a captive customer base, many of whom have no other options but relying on PSE.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. Clearly paying for 43% of the cost of an investment with a return of, at best, only 2% for 10 years, is not the lowest-cost solution.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>It is well known that the lowest-cost solution is energy conservation, and this is working. Many of us who are able to are working hard to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels - through buying lower-energy appliances, installing solar panels, and converting our appliances so our homes run 100% on electricity. Investments like these will decrease the need for fossil fuels and ensure that there is sufficient energy even on the coldest days.</p> <p>At the same time as we work to reduce our energy need, PSE is not investing sufficiently in the wide variety of cost-saving alternatives to a methane plant, such as energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response. Measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers.</p> <p>This fossil fuel plant is also a risky investment. Tacoma has a goal of achieving zero emissions by 2050, which is 27 years, well below the expected lifetime of the LNG plant. It is unclear what the fate of the LNG plant will be moving forward toward this goal.</p> <p>Finally, allowing PSE to force customers to pay for a for-profit venture from which they derive almost no benefit sets a risky precedent that will lead to the continuation of such attempts. Denying the rate increase, instead, sends a clear message that PSE should stick to its job - providing energy to its customers at a fair rate while transitioning toward cleaner energy in keeping with its own stated goals, as well of the goals of Tacoma and the larger region.</p> <p>We urge the UTC to protect us from this unfair and unwarranted requested rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.        Penny Rowe        prowe@harbornet.com        1515 N. Prospect St.        Tacoma, Washington</p>
	Jean Berolzheimer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jean Berolzheimer  
jeanberolz@gmail.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			21421 Monument Rd SW Vashon , Washington 98070
	Susan MacGregor	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Susan MacGregor  seesue@gmail.com  16911 NE 95th  Redmond, Washington 98052</p>
	Doreen McGrath	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Doreen McGrath

doreenmcg@gmail.com

5236 S fontanelle pl,

Seattle, Washington 98118



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	R. Gleysteen	Email	<p>Re: Docket UG-230393 PSE/Port of Tacoma LNG facility rate adjustment</p> <p>Commissioners:</p> <p>There is no reason for the general public to be charged for the costs of building, maintaining and operating PSE’s and the Port of Tacoma’s LNG facility. Whether or not you believe that there is a realizable environmental benefit from the use of LNG as a bridge fuel (and many people do not) in the maritime industry this facility which directly benefits TOTE Maritime and the Port should be paid for by the Port and TOTE.</p> <p>The claim is made that it will also benefit the citizens of Tacoma in cold weather. Somehow those citizens have managed to get through previous winters without a multimillion dollar backup tank but again even if it truly is needed, it should be paid for by the users not the entire PSE grid.</p> <p>That the user pays for the benefits is the bedrock of fairness and should be applied and enforced in regulated monopolies no less than in other commerce.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention.</p> <p>R. Gleysteen</p>
	Pam Beal	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Pam Beal  
pambeal@gmail.com  
204 Contra Costa Ave

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Fircrest, Washington 98466
	Ally Orosco	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Ally Orosco          aorosco000@gmail.com          4515 s g st          Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
	Stephanie Ostmann	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Stephanie Ostmann  ostwomann@gmail.com  906 Manor Dr  Fircrest, Washington 98466</p>
	Sara Burke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Sara Burke  
burksal@yahoo.com  
3020 East K Street  
Tacoma, Washington 98404

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Courtney Davis	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Courtney Davis  c.davis622@gmail.com  1232 S State Street  Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Christopher Freelund</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Christopher Freelund  greatfree1@yahoo.com  3721 48th Ave NE  Tacoma, Washington 98422</p>
	Isabella Palacios	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Isabella Palacios  
isabellanp13@gmail.com  
515 22nd Ave, apt 104  
SEATTLE, Washington 98122

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Judith Miller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
---------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>I am one of those residential customers who opposed the LNG facility from the beginning. Here we are with all our concerns being justified as you look to screw us YET AGAIN!!! NO to support for this climate endangering, life endangering perpetuation of DIRTY ENERGY GREED PERPETUATION!!! NO!</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Judith Miller fyrnrain@gmail.com 523 E. Harrison St. Tacoma, Washington 98404</p>
	Lauren Tozzi	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Lauren Tozzi lrntozzi2@gmail.com 4648 Sunnyside Ave N Seattle, Washington 98103</p>	
	Tom Craighead	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Tom Craighead  
tcvashon@gmail.com  
28203 137th Ave SW  
Vashon, Washington 98070

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

LESLIE  
KREHER

Email

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,  
Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  
The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  
The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.  
The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  
PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  <b>LESLIE KREHER</b>  leslie.kowitz@gmail.com  22537 SE 42nd Terrace, Unit#1188  , Washington 98029</p>
	<p>Lorna Walker</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Lorna Walker  lorniewalker@gmail.com  28203 137th Ave SW  Vashon, Washington 98070</p>
	Jacob Bailey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Jacob Bailey  dreclecnra@aol.com  18809 217th Ave E  Orting, Washington 98360</p>
	Lori Stefano	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Lori Stefano  
lorilstefano@gmail.com  
22440 Vale Court SE  
Yelm, Washington 98597

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Denice Jentlie	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>My husband and I are both self employed and work twice as hard now days to make the same amount of money as we've made for the past three years. We are maxed out and simply can not afford to take on an increase in utilities that do not benefit us!</p> <p>Thank you,          Denice Jentlie          Denice Jentlie          denicejentlie@gmail.com          1929 S Ainsworth Ave          Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	Leslie McClure	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Leslie McClure  lespetmcc@gmail.com  8537 Anderson Ct. NE  Lacey, Washington 98516</p>
	Nancy Cooper	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I oppose any kind of fracking in our earthquake prone region, or any region because of the threat this process poses to clean groundwater supplies. PSE should be developing and providing energy from sources that will NOT add to global warming gases.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Nancy Cooper  
nlecooper@gmail.com  
1643 Jeannette Place  
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Lorie Lucky	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Lorie Lucky          lorie916@gmail.com          28313 Redondo Way s.          Des Moines, Washington 98198</p>
	<p>ANN          GIANTVALLEY</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        ANN GIANTVALLEY        agiantvalley@gmail.com        1190 puget dr se        port orchard, Washington 98366</p>
	Russell Dial	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>This facility is an outrageous scam and a disaster waiting to happen.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Russell Dial  
radial75@gmail.com  
317 E 45TH ST  
Tacoma, Washington 98404

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	<p>Julie Andrzejewski</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Julie Andrzejewski julieruth17@gmail.com 703 Short Street Steilacoom, Washington 98388</p>
	Breck Lebegue	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>Why? Don't charge residential customers for Tote Marine fuel! If LNG is a cleaner bridge fuel than bunker, and helpful until freighters are powered by small nuclear reactors, they can pay. Deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher climate standard too.</p> <p>Thank you. Breck Lebegue MD MPH WA Physicians for Social Responsibility Climate and Health Task Force Breck Lebegue brecklebegue@gmail.com 70 Leschi Drive Steilacoom, Washington 98388</p>
	Niki Quester	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Niki Quester

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>nikiquester@gmail.com  P O Box 502, 9459 Loughrey Ave NE  Indianola, Washington 98342</p>
	David Bluhm	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Please do not approve any residential rate increases for Puget Sound Energy.  Thank you.  David Bluhm  wholenightsky@gmail.com  3835 McKinley Ave.  Tacoma, Washington 98404-2941</p>
	lisa oldoski	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  lisa oldoski  LOLDOSKI@YAHOO.COM  1211East 35TH St  Tacoma, Washington 98404</p>
	Barbara Bonfield	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Barbara Bonfield  
bgbonfield@gmail.com  
5702 N 33rd St Unit 4D  
Tacoma, Washington 98407

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Lynne Ashton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Lynne Ashton  lynnewashton@gmail.com  10175 NE Shore Drive  Indianola, Washington 98342</p>
	Jane Millard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Jane Millard ranejay@yahoo.com 1339 Spruce Dr Enumclaw, Washington 98022</p>
	Brad Barton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>I know you are getting a lot of these letters but read them carefully. Every letter, word, sentence in this letter is true and outlines the problem with utilities—particularly fossil methane ones. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Brad Barton  
Barton.bradley3@gmail.com  
5910 147 th st sw  
Edmonds, Washington 98026

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Molly Frankel	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	---------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Molly Frankel  moe.frankel@gmail.com  3401 Pacific Ave  Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
	Joseph Sweitzer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Joseph Sweitzer        jsweitzer99@gmail.com        1723 119th St. S.        Tacoma, Washington 98444</p>
	Sarah Ostheller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Sarah Ostheller        chik.zilla@gmail.com        1030 South 63rd Street,        Tacoma, Washington 98408</p>
	Francis Patterson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Francis Patterson  
Brijpatterson@gmail.com  
3016 S. Washington St.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Tacoma , Washington 98409
	Jeanne Poirier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          I absolutely agree with this message! Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Jeanne Poirier          jeannepoirier@yahoo.com          P.O. Box 228          Cashmere, Washington 98815</p>
	Mary Lynn	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          PSE should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Mary Lynn  melynn50@gmail.com  3705 N Gove St  Tacoma , Washington 98407</p>
	<p>Laura Regan</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Laura Regan  
laregan43@gmail.com  
9650 Shore Drive Unit 2009  
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Susan Goldstein	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	-----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Susan Goldstein susanrgoldstein@gmail.com 14621 McGregor Blvd. Unit 9 Ft. Myers , Florida 33908</p>
	Michael Bordenave	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Michael Bordenave  mbordenave1016@gmail.com  951 N Adoline Ave  Fresno, California 93728</p>
	Robert Posch	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Robert Posch  
robertposch323@gmail.com  
1612 Pepper Grass Ct  
Orlando, Florida 32825

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Joanne Gates	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Joanne Gates          jobunny98@gmail.com          21 Burke Rd          Peterborough, New Hampshire 03458</p>
	Derek Gendvil	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Derek Gendvil  dgendvil@gmail.com  9030 w. Sahara Ave. #360  Las Vegas , Nevada 89117</p>
	Shawna Stonum	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Shawna Stonum  stonum.shawna@gmail.com  124 TULE LAKE RD E  TACOMA, Washington 98445-1546</p>
	Jessica Boutte	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jessica Boutte  
Jessicamboutte0@gmail.com  
7320 6th Ave  
Tacoma , Washington 98406

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Suzanne Hudson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Suzanne Hudson suhudson7@gmail.com 2220 Westridge Ave W Tacoma, Washington 98466</p>
	Selene Russo	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. I DO NOT want to pay to subsidize dirty power that’s not even for residential use. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Selene Russo        selenee@me.com        9436 11th Ave SW        Seattle, Washington 98106</p>
	Lorna Walker	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Lorna Walker  
lorniewalker@gmail.com  
28203 137th Ave SW  
Vashon, Washington 98070

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Steven Hawkins	Email	<p>PSE,</p> <p>Why don't you do as we do in the multi-large commercial and industrial construction world and look at ways to drive better efficiencies in your operating processes and elimination of waste and unnecessary resources rather than just jumping to proposing a rate increase.</p> <p>Oh, I know why. You don't have any competition so you don't have to be lean in your processes. The customer pays for your lack of diligence and doing what is right by the end user, the customer.</p> <p>Hawkins</p>
	Lena Rudquist	Email	<p>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.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Daniel Grey	Email	<p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>PSE proceeded with the LNG Terminal in opposition to large numbers of their consumers. Now they want us to pay for what they forced upon us and which will only benefit the profits for PSE and the maritime industry they catered this project to.  Let the maritime industry pay for what they shopped for and the rest if the PSE customers be responsible for the costs of our service.  Enough of this foolishness. The CEOS who pushed for this project should have their salaries garnished to pay for it.</p> <p>Daniel Grey  6533 55th St Ct W  University Place, WA 98467</p>
	Skip	Email	<p>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.</p> <p>Skip  &lt;&gt;&lt;  Psalm 118:8  Lakewood, WA</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joel A. James	Email	<p>As a home owner in Snohomish County. I should not have to pay “taxes” to support southern Puget Sound. From what I read; the transportation costs are going up 85%. This is absurd and shocking that PSE officials would have accepted such increases. It’s apparent that PSE is not protecting customers by trying to find better rates and instead is simply trying to push their increases to customers. With record inflation the past few years and receiving minimal pay increases, my family simply cannot afford this. We have already had to pay higher insurance rates, food cost, fuel costs, mandatory State Long Term Insurance, some have been hit hard with RTA Taxes, and it has to stop. If PSE cannot get serious about keeping prices legit, then we need a new source for NG. I’m about to be fixed on income when I retire. It seems the State is doing everything possible to force us out. Carbon taxes, ferry taxes, road taxes – all bogues because the earth has been through countless heating and cooling cycles yet we didn’t have carbon back then so explain how this time around it’s our fault for climate change? Road taxes – I-405 we built using our taxpayer dollars. More taxes to pay for extra lanes, but instead of using them for traffic, the State wants to make a buck by tolling them. Double taxation with out representation. Don’t tell me that Inslee is representing us because that is not true. We need to get back to the real world. We have been paying taxes a long time. We pay taxes on everything we eat, drink, wear, live, &amp; smell. If there is something out there that the State can tax, they will. Even in death, the State wants your estate. It’s pathetic how PSE can just at will dump on us. I vote democrat normally but this ignorance is causing me to look the other way. I was born here and pushing 60. I won’t die here, I’ll take my taxes and move to another state because it’s become that pathetic to remain here. Highest gas tax in the nation! No thanks Washington. This will be the slogan at the voting booth people. PSE, stop this nonsense.</p> <p>Joel A. James  6611 103rd ST NE  Marysville, WA 98270</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michael Chapman	Email	Before we about taking more of the customers hard earned and less available funds - How much did PSE make last year? How much of these costs should be considered a part of the business and require the use of profits before we look at increasing consumers rates an exorbitant amount?
	Jenny Rowe	Email	I am writing to you about Puget Sound Energy’s request (Docket UG-230393) to raise energy/gas rates and have it affect residential homeowners the most. Please do not approve the raise on any gas or utility rates. Customers in the King County region already pay more than enough for public utilities. To properly heat a single family home in Bellevue WA can run between 350-500 in the winter months. Please find a way to decrease the recurring costs for people to help make our place the most wonderful, cozy place to live.  Thank you,  Jenny Rowe
	Robert Bauer	Email	As a retired veteran in a fixed income, you ALL are destroying me financially. Bad enough gasoline is the HIGHEST in the nation in Wa state. Now there's going to be a tariff on my source of heat for this winter? Can't imagine what other veterans, disabled and the elderly are going through.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Julie Brown	Email	<p>I object to the proposed rate increase by PSE for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To the extend 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.</li> <li>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. Do not increase their burden even more when Commercial customers are far more able to afford this price increase.</li> </ol> <p>Sincerely,  Julie Brown  PSE customer</p>
	Shawna Stafford	Email	<p>No New TAXES! Corporations are bleeding us dry. Inflation is up as are corporate profits. Tax the corporations and uber wealthy not us struggling to heat our homes and cook the food we can hardly afford.</p> <p>Shawna Stafford</p> <p>Tacoma WA</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michele Bourque	Email	<p>Hello!</p> <p>What I am seeing from these rate increase proposals is oppression of the poor. A transportation rate schedule increase of 85% is outrageous! Climate change is here and it looks like greed and graft. The climate of the heart and character is the emergency.  Your thoughtful consideration of the above mentioned items is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Michele Bourque</p>
	Mike Burghardt	Email	<p>This is a public comment to Docket UG-230393 PSE proposal to assign a tariff to LNG customers to pay for a new port terminal in Tacoma. The request should be denied. PSE determined to build this terminal for their use. If they intended to raise rates as a result of said terminal they needed to request adjustments to rates prior to proceeding with the project. They chose to build the facility now they must live within their existing fee structure. Customers should not be funding their projects.</p> <p>Recommend that the State deny the request to raise fees.</p> <p>Mike Burghardt  Dissatisfied PSE customer  Auburn, WA</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Terry Anne Johnson	Email	Why do residents outside the effected area have to pay? Does not seem appropriate or fair to me. Terry Anne Johnson
	Yory Flores	Email	Please we don't need anything else getting more expensive. The public is already downing due to the current state of the financial market  Yory Flores
	Annabelle Zastrow	Email	I don't believe that I should have to pay a natural gas rate hike for pipes that were built two counties away. I live in Everett. The work needing to be back-paid for was done in Tacoma. If Tacoma residents are going to benefit from the 4 miles of pipe, the city of Tacoma should be paying for it. Not residents of Everett or anywhere else.  Natural gas customer from Everett, WA
	Nick Davis	Email	Please do not increase rates as requested by PSE Docket UG-230393.  Respectfully, Nick Davis

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Chanda Emery	Email	<p>Hello</p> <p>Not sure if this is applicable to City of Seattle but if it is then here's my comment:</p> <p>Please do not increase the rates that we currently pay.</p> <p>Seattle is already extremely expensive and many of us single parents with kids struggle to afford to live here.</p> <p>We don't want higher bills (rate increases) at this time when salaries have remained unchanged since 2019.</p> <p>Thanks Chanda</p>
	Bernardo Perez	Email	<p>I vote NO more rate hikes. Barely can afford it now.</p> <p>Bernardo Perez 206-954-8273</p>
	Robert Dennis	Email	<p>One transportation rate schedule will see a rate increase of 85.05% while sales rate schedules will see a rate decrease of 0.08%.</p> <p>Really? Ya think no one will see this money grab?</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lorinda Padgett	Email	<p>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.</p> <p>Lorinda Padgett  2514 85th Dr NE unit y-3  Lake Stevens, Wa 98258</p> <p>425-322-3009</p>
	Stephen and Barbara Woycke	Email	<p>PSE is asking for natural gas rate increases which will negatively impact Vashon Island residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Vashon islanders lobbied long and hard against the new PSE Tacoma natural gas facility they now want to be compensated for. PSE was asked to promote solar and wind (electric) development and usage in lieu of fossil fuel usage (the natural gas facility), which they refused to do in any meaningful way.</p> <p>PSE does not deserve to be compensated for further harming our environment after refusing to take an opposite course of action.</p> <p>Stephen and Barbara Woycke  Vashon Residents</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dave Stringer	Email	Please I don't raise our energy rates. We as the working class have suffered cost increases on EVERYTHING in the last 2yrs. Without increasing our wages. This year alone my rent increased 9.5%. I cannot afford anymore!!! Stop squeezing us to death. Thanks for your time I
	Kate Thomson	Email	Please do not increase rates for customers. It is getting harder and harder every month to pay for household needs. We've never been so stretched. Please find a way so that we're not stretched even further. Thomson household
	Danna Morse	Email	<p>am writing this email because I cannot join in the discussion regarding rate Increases as I'm working 60 hours a week just to pay for a roof over my head and a measkey \$200 a month in food. You try to eat with only \$200 a month left over.</p> <p>No rate increases! Please. For the love of humanity, we cannot take this anymore!</p> <p>My water bill alone is \$250. I can't afford groceries. I go to get help from the state and I make too much at \$24/hr! Gas is \$5.50 a gallon.</p> <p>Then they say to go to the food banks at churches but by the time I get there, all of the illegals have already picked through all the available foods because they are not working, can show up first thing in the morning and since they are coming here with families living in households of five mouths to feed, there's nothing left for working people. Citizens. Exhausted workers!</p> <p>We are taxed at every turn and at every turn there's more rate increases for basic needs right around the next corner.</p> <p>Tell the WEF, the UN, Gates, BlackRock, the King of England, and Biden that THEY can incur</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>the cost.</p> <p>If they would stop giving our money to Ukraine, you wouldn't have to ask us, the hardworking people of America, to pay for it.</p> <p>The federal government should be paying for all of this infrastructure as we already give them plenty of tax money to do just this.</p> <p>Ask them.</p> <p>And no, no giving monies from our payments for smart meters, either. The government wants them to spy on us, start fires in areas where there are proposed land grabs for 15-minute cities (concentration camps) and make us sick with the pulses, they can pay for them.</p> <p>Even better, ask Tom Wheeler to pay for them since they are that "damned important".</p> <p>We've had it. Balance the books.</p> <p>I have, obviously, had enough of the slow kill.</p>
	Chelsea Fredlund	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the rate increases purposed in docket UG-230393. I don't think the cost of this project should be passed along to the consumer during high times of inflation. I hope PSE explored obtaining funding for this through the state or other means. It seems irresponsible for them to not have had secured the money prior to starting this project and now retroactively asking the consumer to foot the bill.</p> <p>Chelsea Fredlund PSE customer North Bend</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Emily Graham	Email	<p>My name is Emily Graham and I live in Fremont. Normally, I am in favor of taxes to pay for infrastructure for the community. However, I believe this moment is different.</p> <p>I have actively opposed the construction and operation of the Tacoma LNG for years due to its safety and environmental hazards. On safety, a plant like this is very dangerous for the surrounding community and I do not believe PSE's safety record represents that it can safely operate such a plant. On the environment, we NEED to be moving away from natural gas rather than forcing the community to pay for further gas infrastructure. There is no such thing as "renewable" natural gas and it additionally causes indoor air quality hazards which can lead to asthma in children and vulnerable adults, as well as more serious issues such as cardiac disease.</p> <p>I oppose ANY tariff to pay for this fossil fuel infrastructure and believe that PSE should be solely responsible for paying for their new fossil fuel plant.</p> <p>Thank you,  Emily</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rayna and Jay Holtz	Email	<p>My family asks that you deny this rate increase. We support efforts to slow climate change, but this natural gas refinery is NOT a viable way to make progress. In fact, it will slow progress. After reading numerous articles and studies, I am convinced that this will be the source of more methane and more greenhouse gas warming than the fuels it is supposed to replace. It also appears that the biggest market for it is likely in China, which has made only lukewarm commitments to slowing climate change. It appears that both PSE and China prefer to treat this climate crisis as an opportunity to make profits on the production, sales, and use of this fuel even after the leading scientists studying the issue have declared it to be a hindrance, rather than a help, in slowing climate problems.</p> <p>It is unfair to ask the ratepayers to cover the costs of something they decided to build for their profits. Had they put the money into wind and solar energy instead, all of us would soon be saving money as well as cleaning our atmosphere of carbon and methane.</p> <p>Moreover, it is not appropriate for them to have built on the traditional land of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians without securing their approval. They do not approve. It is wrong to ask ratepayers to fund something that we feel is unjust as well as unwise and irresponsible.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Rayna and Jay Holtz,  unhappy Puget Sound Energy customers</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sara Bhakti	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Re: Docket UG-230393  No residential rate increase for Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel and not residential services.  Even if, as PSE claims, for the first ten years of use the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, or backup power, that would be only few days a year.  It would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not fair to the customers who would pay for something they are likely not to use.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost.”  I propose that “lowest cost” should include considerations of the proposal’s effect on the climate crisis with more methane emissions, the effect of more fracking on groundwater that communities drink from, with associated health impacts such as cancer and birth defects.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry. It’s time to change its business model.  I urge UTC to deny the requested rate increase.  Thank you for the opportunity to comment.  Sara Bhakti  sarabhakti@yahoo.com  22975 SE Black Nugget Rd  , Washington</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Fred Greef	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Fred Greef  fredgreef@gmail.com  249 Bates Rd  White Salmon, Washington 98672</p>
	<p>Leo Kucewicz</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Leo Kucewicz  j14lion@gmail.com  201 Black Walnut Drive Phoenixville Pa 19460 Usa  Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, United States of America, Pennsylvania 19460</p>
	Sandra Hostetler	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Sandra Hostetler        hostetlersj@gmail.com        65259 Mitchellii Ln        Cassopolis, Michigan 49031</p>
	Kenzie K	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Sincerely and Urgently~  
Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Kenzie K  macknapp01@gmail.com  860 115th Street S  Parkland, Washington 98444</p>
	<p>Rosemary Moore</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Rosemary Moore  rosemarymoore100@hotmail.com  6230 East Mercer Way  Mercer Island, Washington 98040</p>
	JOSEPH MCGEE	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>It is outrageous that in the fact of the natural calamities we are currently witnessing brought on or exacerbated by climate change that communities are being asked to continue subsidizing the fossil fuels industries. The term LNG itself is an industry promoted misnomer. It is more accurate to call this product LFG, Liquefied Fossil Gas. In fact, it is mostly methane infused with other toxic and questionable gases.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  <b>JOSEPH MCGEE</b>  josephtmcgee999@gmail.com  6947 Marvin Rd NE  OLYMPIA, Washington 98502</p>
	Julie Stone	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you. Julie Stone juliestone20@gmail.com 8642 Sobek Lane Concrete, Washington 98237</p>
	Pamela Ng	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p><b>NO NEW RATE INCREASE FOR LNG REFINERY NOR FOSSIL FUEL REFINERIES.</b></p> <p>Thank you.  Pamela Ng  roundbox65@gmail.com  9732 14th Ave NW  Seattle, Washington 98117</p>
	<p>Monty Smith</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Monty Smith msmithlok@yahoo.com 3705 N Gove Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	Joann Terranova	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Joann Terranova  
annjo@mac.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>1620 Woodard Ave. NW Unit B1          Olympia, Washington 98502</p>
	<p>Richard Heggen</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Richard Heggen  tubegeek@nventure.com  6444 N. Five Views Rd.  Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	<p>Kayln Olds</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Kayln Olds  kyln.olds@gmail.com  519 127th st E  Tacoma, Washington 98445</p>
	Judy Schultz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Judy Schultz        heyjudenf@gmail.com        2741 Bush Street        San Francisco, California 94115</p>
	<p>Karly Strobel</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  Karly Strobel  karbar036@hotmail.com  519 127th st e  Tacoma, Washington 98445</p>
	<p>Gabby Connors</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  To Whom It May Concern:  My name is Gabby Connors, and I am writing today regarding the proposed residential customer rate increase for Puget Sound Energy to cover the costs of constructed the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you,  Gabby Connors  (she/her)  Gabby Connors  gnconnors@gmail.com  8612 Palatine Ave N  Seattle, Washington 98103</p>
	Lael White	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. This not an equitable investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of serving the needs of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Lael White  
laelcwhite@gmail.com  
6707 230th Street SW  
Mountlake Terrace, Washington 98043

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Helen Edwards	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Helen Edwards  Helen Edwards  helen.valmere.edwards1@gmail.com  3705 N Gove St  Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	Rafael Silva	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Rafael Silva          eunaquero@gmail.com          2346 S Grant Ave          Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	Matthew Boguske	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes the lowest cost, the UTC must start including more than just the upfront financial cost in its deliberations. 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 human health costs related to these events. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction, and men camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years before PSE obtained the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers. The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Matthew Boguske  
Matthew Boguske  
matthew.boguske@gmail.com  
8500 148 Ave NE #B1005  
Redmond, Washington 98052

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Ashley Mabbitt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Ashley Mabbitt  ash_sears@yahoo.com  16709 25TH Avenue Ct E  Tacoma, Washington 98445</p>
	<p>Florence and  Kenneth Robinson</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Florence and Kenneth Robinson          flokenr@gmail.com          Unit 311 140 Darlington Pvt          Ottawa, ON, Ontario K1V 0X7</p>
	<p>Katherine Woolverton</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>It is widely known that PSE makes its profit through capital projects, not from the sale of fossil gas. This project is another boondoggle designed to make PSE money off the backs of residential gas customers.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Katherine Woolverton  
kwoolverton@gmail.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			7755 16TH AVE SW SEATTLE, Washington 98106
	Alexandra Miller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Alexandra Miller          alexem224@gmail.com          1500 N Warner St          Tacoma, Washington 98416</p>
	Keith Dunavant	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Keith Dunavant          kd46379@gmail.com          2102 Yakima          Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	Nana Hartfield	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Nana Hartfield  
nanahartfield@yahoo.com  
2515 So 47th Street A2

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Tacoma, Washington 98409
	Mic Didier	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Mic Didier          micdidier11@gmail.com          3716 Tacoma Ave S          Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
	Clayton Jones	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Clayton Jones  seajay21649@gmail.com  4246 S 148th St  Tukwila, Washington 98168</p>
	Alonna Mitz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Alonna Mitz  
alonnमितz.am@gmail.com  
510 N J St. Apt. 1  
Tacoma, Washington 98403

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Diana Sharon	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed</p>
--	--------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Diana Sharon          dianasharon@hotmail.com          9603 Old Highway 99 SE          Olympia, Washington 98501</p>
	<p>Michael Madden</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Michael Madden  myke907@gmail.com  50 Germonds Road  New city, New York 10956</p>
	Craig Mueller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Craig Mueller          croakland@gmail.com          5215 S Prospect Street          Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	<p>Krista Johnson</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Krista Johnson  den.unbowed_02@icloud.com  6802 N 13th St  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	<p>Phillip Hope</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately impact already overburdened and marginalized communities—namely the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

immigrants living in NW Detention Center. This has been recognized by the Tacoma Human Rights Commission.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Phillip Hope  
phillip.hope@gmail.com  
319 Avenue C  
New York, New York 10009

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	David Perk	Email	<p>I am a Puget Sound Energy rate payer for natural gas.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Commission to deny PSE any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas facility.</p> <p>PSE should recoup their LNG facility costs by selling LNG as maritime fuel, as they promised when they built the facility on Puyallup Tribe territory without adequate permits or permission.</p> <p>It is essential that the Commission retain some shred of institutional memory. There was a massive public response in opposition to the construction of the facility. It was an environmental injustice. PSE should not be allowed to recoup their costs from ratepayers, especially when many of us opposed the facility.</p> <p>PSE needs to work harder to live up to its clean energy commitments. If they can't recoup their costs on the Tacoma LNG facility they should close it down, write it off and dismantle it.</p> <p>I strongly urge the the Commission to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard -- one that ensures a faster transition to clean renewable energy.</p> <p>David Perk Seattle</p>
	Teryn Recge	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Teryn Recge  
terynreche@gmail.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>1112 mlk jr way          tacoma , Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Sarah Deumling</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Sarah Deumling  sdeumling@gmail.com  4550 Oak Grove Rd.  Rickreall, Oregon 97371</p>
	Steve Thompson	Email	<p>Honorable UTC,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE pursues large infrastructure projects that maximize profits for its investors, but which have not been shown to make measurable improvements in reliability metrics or the daily lives of PSE customers.</li> <li>• Many of PSE’s customer vigorously opposed the massive Tacoma LNG plant and storage facility because it is manifestly harmful to the environment.</li> <li>• This facility is predicated on PSE’s false assertion that 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 are moving to curtail the use of gas in buildings.</li> </ul> <p>In general, PSE is a bad faith player in regard to everyone's environmental safety and climate carbon reduction.</p> <p>Steve Thompson  Redmond WA 98052</p>
	Melissa Brooks	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Melissa Brooks  melissabrooks25@gmail.com  29817 4th Ave SW  Federal Way, Washington 98023</p>
	<p>Rose Stacy</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Rose Stacy          kstacy001@gmail.com          8418 82nd street SW #202          Tacoma, Washington 98498</p>
	<p>PAMELA PEREZ</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  PAMELA PEREZ  pperezmama123@gmail.com  13503 97 Ave E., unit 205  Puyallup, Washington 98373</p>
	Fayette Krause	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Fayette Krause  
fkrause@olympus.net  
2315 Madrona St.,  
pt townsend, Washington 98368-2730

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Valerie Costa	Email	<p>Dear Washington UTC - I am appalled that Puget Sound Energy is asking Washington state for permission to increase gas rates by 3.45%. For years I spent countless hours trying to stop PSE from building its LNG facility in Tacoma. I sat and listened to the company lie about the plans for the facility and its potential impact. I painfully watched the construction of the giant tank, while PSE hadn't received all its permits, on land that the Puyallup tribe claim rights to. I saw government at all levels fail to stop this monstrosity, even under the cleanest, greenest gubernatorial leadership in the nation. Please do not approve this rate increase. Rates have already gone up recently and another increase just puts more money in PSE's pockets, which slows the expansion to renewable energy. Valerie Costa 2428 E Roy St, Seattle WA 98112</p>
	Judy LeBlanc	Email	<p>Dear commissioners, PSE should not receive a rate increase to pay for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. PSE wants to raise residential gas rates by 3.45%. Most importantly, this facility has been opposed by the tribes, many environmental groups and individuals such as myself. I do not think ratepayers should have to cover the costs of this facility through increased rates when it only or mainly benefits shipping. Also, it causes harm to the environment, poses environmental risks to tribes in adjoining land and goes against our state's efforts to reduce green house gas emissions. This will not benefit ratepayers in general and will add costs for people already struggling to pay their utility bills. Thank you, Judy LeBlanc</p>
	Kayla Hipp	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Kayla Hipp



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>kaylahipp14@gmail.com          510 N J Street          Tacoma, Washington 98403</p>
	<p>Leah Ford</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Leah Ford  liyah_3@yahoo.com  6704 47th Street Ct W  University Place, Washington 98466</p>
	<p>johanna aucoin-slaunwhite</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>The Climate Crisis is world wide. Please take the lead to save our planet. Thank you.        Johanna Aucoin-Slaunwhite, Margaret Stewart 25 Broadholme Lane, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3M 3B8        johanna aucoin-slaunwhite        nannyjoaucoin@gmail.com        25 broadholme lane        halifax, Nova Scotia b3m 3b8</p>
	Heather Price	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Heather Price  
huprice@gmail.com  
4018 NE 73rd St  
Seattle, Washington 98115

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Kenya Shakoor	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>
--	---------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Kenya Shakoor  ktshakoor@gmail.com  1609 S. 86th St.  TACOMA, Washington 98444</p>
	Ashley Ouellette	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Ashley Ouellette          agirl1018@gmail.com          311 Granite St          Biddeford, Maine 04005</p>
	Mechtild Uhe	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Mechtild Uhe  
mechtild.uhe@gmail.com  
271 Shaw Blvd.  
Richmond Hill, Ontario L4C 5T9

	Laura M. Karlin	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the
--	-----------------	-------	---



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  Laura M. Karlin  karlin.lolly@gmail.com  31921 Webster Rd E  Eatonville , Washington 98328-8676</p>
	Theresa Vlad	Email	<p>I think it is especially cruel to raise rates at this time when everything is so expensive. The term tariff is reminiscent of when we were subjects of a king.  As a person on a fixed income I find this especially difficult and unwarranted as well. It is unreasonable to penalize we taxpayers and homeowners by making our natural resources so expensive.  Theresa Vlad</p>
	Gina Singh	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Gina Singh  zefrea@gmail.com  3519 N Union Ave  Tacoma , Washington 98407</p>
	Tony Russo	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Tony Russo  
russotony46@gmail.com  
9436 11th Ave. SW  
Seattle, Washington 98106

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Aimee Hamilton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Aimee Hamilton          hamiltal@plu.edu          2508 S Sheridan Avenue          Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Louisa Beal</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          I was under the impression that this facility (LNG) was for maritime purposes and NOT to be paid for by residential customers. I am wondering if this is a case of fraud perpetrated on consumers. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Louisa Beal          alderuniverse@gmail.com          205 Berkeley Ave          Fircrest, Washington 98466</p>
	Tia Bottger	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          This 8 million gallon tank located at the border of the Puyallup reservation, on land that was protected by the Medicine Creek treaty before the port added landfill into the water as a loophole. It endangers the community to the negative health consequences of natural gas from pipeline</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

leakages (cancer, asthma, birth defects etc.) and the risk of explosion being equivalent to the force of an atomic bomb. It has been adamantly opposed by the tribe and community, but these voices have been ignored. At the very least, don't make us pay for the facility that was never wanted in the first place.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Tia Bottger  tbottger@pugetsound.edu  934 N Alder St  Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Allie Corrigan	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Allie Corrigan ac_corrigan@yahoo.com 6721 South C St Tacoma, Washington 98408</p>
	JP Kemmick	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
JP Kemmick  
jpkemmick@gmail.com  
2906 N Mason  
Tacoma, Washington 98407

Guila Muir

Email

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Guila Muir  guila@guilamuir.com  3724 38th Ave South  Seattle, Washington 98144</p>
	Russell Burke	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Russell Burke russellburke@comcast.net 16700 Guerneville Rd Guerneville, California 95446</p>
	Vicky de Monterey Tichoux	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Fossil fuels are over - our future must be only renewable, sustainable energy and efficiency/conservation. No more passing on fossil fuel costs to customers!</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Vicky de Monterey Tichoux vicky@tubatoast.com PO Box 569 Vashon, Washington 98070</p>
	Cheryl Diamond	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Cheryl Diamond diamondcl@juno.com 35006 19th Ave sw Federal way, Washington 98023</p>
	Andrea O'Ferrall	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  I am sending this primarily form letter because it is exhausting to fight every wrong going on in

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

our society right now. One wrong to prevent is Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Andrea O’Ferrall andreaoferrall@comcast.net 9807 25th Ave SW Seattle, Washington 98106</p>
	Lucia Faithfull	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Lucia Faithfull lfaithfull@comcast.net 1232 SW 296th St Federal Way, Washington 98023</p>
	Susan Aigner	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Susan Aigner Susanaigner@comcast.net 24817 184th PI SE Covington, Washington 98042</p>
	Dan Casey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Dan Casey</p> <p>Dan Casey          dcasey2574@msn.com          4333 North Visscher St          Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	Natalie Scalf	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Natalie Scalf natalie-scalf@comcast.net 901 S 56th St Tacoma, Washington 98408</p>
	Pamela Brocious	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Pamela Brocious pam@citistaffing.com 340 E. 93rd St, 14M New York, New York 10128</p>	
	Carol Kindt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Carol Kindt  carolkindt@msn.com  5939 North 26th Street, Apt. 100, Apt. 100 Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	<p>Ruth Schaefer</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Ruth Schaefer ruthschaefer@comcast.net PO Box 99812 Seattle, Washington 98139</p>
	Marty Adams	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Marty Adams madams32931@frontier.com 582 Walla Walla Way La Conner, Washington 98257
--	--	--	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	jamie hill	Email	<p>Hi friends!</p> <p>I wanted to send a short note opposing the proposed rate increase for Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>Let's be frank: their rationales for asking for this rate increase are kind of bullshit. Public demand for natural gas isn't going to increase — everyone's moving to heat pumps, and there are a bunch of new state and local regulations limiting the use of gas in new developments. Everyone knows which way the wind is blowing for natural gas, and it's not in the direction PSE is trying to claim it is.</p> <p>PSE is simply looking for a way to fund a project for which they haven't properly figured out funding. And the maddening thing is that it's not even going to benefit us residential customers much at all — it's mainly going to benefit the shipping industry. Which is fine? But it shouldn't be our problem. They shouldn't be trying to foist these costs onto us, and you shouldn't be letting them do it.</p> <p>Also, let's be real: building more gas infrastructure is a bad investment. PSE should be investing in energy efficiency, energy storage, and demand response. Those would improve reliability, would be much better for the climate, and they could either invest the savings into their dumb LNG project if that's what they feel they need to do, or simply pass the lower costs along to us customers (I'd personally be into the second option).</p> <p>I imagine you're also hearing from lobbyists with a bunch of money to help make their point, whereas we are just simple normal people armed with not much more than the ability to write emails, so I feel frankly fairly cynical about whether you'll even take this message on board in any meaningful way. But I figured it couldn't hurt.</p> <p>Thanks for your time — jamie</p> <p>-- jamie hill</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	John Carlton	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>
--	--------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>John Carlton  ixora@harbournet.com  1004 S. Steele  Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	Wendy Murphey	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Wendy Murphey  
wendy@genuine-artists.com  
4958 Gloria Ave  
Encino, CA, California 91436

Susan Gillespie

Email

Utilities\_and\_Transportation\_Commission ,

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE has no right to raise rates for residential customers to pay for the construction costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas facility, which we are opposed to being built!

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Susan Gillespie  archielev@msn.com  26231 188th Ave. SE  COVINGTON, Washington 98042</p>
	Karin Carr	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Karin Carr dave.carr@comcast.net 7237 S Fife St Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>	
	Dwight Rousu	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Any moneys should go to solar, wind, and insulation. Expand net metering.

The main purpose of this LNG facility is for dirty maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Dwight Rousu  rousu@frontier.com  13824 NE 70th Pl  Redmond, Washington 98052</p>
	Ken Steinman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Ken Steinman  ksteinman@comcast.net  1502 55th St Ne  Tacoma, Washington 98422</p>
	sandford anderson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>sandford anderson  otto@wightman.ca  39206 Nature Center Road  Belgrave, Ontario N0G1E0</p>
	<p>Native Daily Network</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Native Daily Network  ndn@natedailynetwork.org  2508 S 54TH ST  TACOMA, Washington 98409-7026</p>
	<p>William Biederman</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
William Biederman  
wjb259@gmail.com  
259 Shorewood Court

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Fox Island, Washington 98333
	Barry Oaks	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Barry Oaks  barrysoaks@gmail.com  86313 Franklin Blvd  Eugene, Oregon 97405</p>
	Wendy Krakauer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Wendy Krakauer        cosauer6212@gmail.com        6212 Corliss Ave N        Seattle, Washington 98103</p>
	<p>Sara Murphy        Solano</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard. I do not want the city I live in and my neighbors' futures to be further invested in fossil fuels. And I believe placing more financial burden on Tacoma residents will exacerbate the already dire housing and financial crises that many Tacoma residents are going through. I urge the Utilities and

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Transport Commission to make the decision that will protect and provide for Tacoma residents' futures.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Sara Murphy Solano</p> <p>Sara Murphy Solano smurphysolano@pugetsound.edu 614 S Steele St. Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	Eric Lee	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Eric Lee  mrrhinol@yahoo.com  10 Ponce de Leon Creek SW  Lakewood , Washington 98499</p>
	Kenra Brewer	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Kenra Brewer        kenrabrewer@gmail.com        815 E 46th St        Tacoma, Washington 98404</p>
	Scott McClay	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. Also, it is clear that maritime use of gas will not last-- shipping must quickly stop using any type of fossil fuels, and the maritime industry is moving strongly toward that goal.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          Scott McClay          scottmc@riseup.net          7020 18th Ave SW          Seattle, Washington 98106</p>
	<p>Nik Coulter</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Nik Coulter          ncoulter034@gmail.com          440 St Helens Ave, Unit 103          Tacoma, Washington 98402</p>
	<p>Calvin Beardemphl</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Calvin Beardemphl        your.gr8.pal.cal@gmail.com        3215 S 47th St Apt 26        Tacoma, Washington 98409</p>
	Kevin Sims	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Kevin Sims  
kevinasims86@gmail.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>8418 82nd st Sw        Lakewood, Washington 98498</p>
	<p>Judith Knight</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.        The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.        The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Judith Knight        judith.knight22@gmail.com        728 N Orchard        Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Whalen Michael	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Whalen Michael          sparta1396@hotmail.com          7615 48th Street Ct W          University Pl, Washington 98467</p>
	Asphodel Denning	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Asphodel Denning  
asphodeldenning@hotmail.com  
108 5th Ave S

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			Seattle, Washington 98104
	sidonie wittman	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  sidonie wittman  sidonie.wittman@gmail.com  8606 10th Ave se  Seattle, Washington 98106</p>
	Michael Williams	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Michael Williams  
williams.mike.g@gmail.com  
4114 Yakima Ave  
Tacoma, Washington 98418



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sharon Burke	Email	<p>I oppose Puget Sound Energy's request for a rate increase to pay for the cost of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PSE made a profit-driven decision to build the Tacoma LNG facility to make money for their company while providing no benefit whatsoever to its residential customers. Asking their customers to pay for this project is unconscionable. Any costs relating to the Tacoma LNG facility should come from PSE's profits, not customers.</li> <li>2. The Tacoma LNG facility was strongly opposed by local communities, including the Puyallup Tribe, environmental groups and Governor Inslee. PSE rammed this project through without any consideration other than their own financial gain.</li> <li>3. Building a liquified natural gas facility on the banks of Puget Sound was an incredibly dangerous decision. One day the Cascadia fault will release a 9.0 earthquake and when this facility explodes and/or leaks vast amounts of liquified natural gas into Puget Sound, I wonder what the reaction of PSE will be. No doubt they will file for bankruptcy or try to pass along all of the cleanup costs to their customers as is now being done with this latest rate increase request.</li> <li>4. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission should protect PSE customers, not the financial coffers of Puget Sound Energy.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you,  Sharon Burke</p>
	Margo Polley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  We pleaded with PSE to not build this facility. We wrote, we petitioned, we made comments, we protested side by side with Puyullap elders. They built it anyway, without permits, without listening to our concerns, ignoring indigenous treaty rights well as the terrifying effects of climate change. Therefore, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Margo Polley

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>polleym@hotmail.com  44912 SE 146th St  North Bend , Washington 98045</p>
	<p>Justine Eister</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you,  Justine  Justine Eister  justine.eister@gmail.com  4609 S L Street  TACOMA, Washington 98408</p>
	Julie Miller	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Julie Miller  jumill038@gmail.com  11021 Park Ave S  Tacoma, Washington 98444</p>
	Debra Hoheisel	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I will not be able to attend the public meeting on Wed, Nov 1. My only comment is that as a Snohomish County resident living in Lynnwood - my rates should not go up to pay for Pierce County!</p> <p>Debra Hoheisel  Cell: 425-218-5547</p>
	Jeremy Cragin	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          Jeremy Cragin          jeremycragin@yahoo.com          1934 S Cushman Ave          Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Evelyn Dial</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Evelyn Dial dialophone@gmail.com 618 N 64th St Seattle, Washington 98103</p>
	Marteena Jones	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Don’t let PSE burden customers with their costs to build a dirty industrial facility. We need to focus on cleaner energy now!</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Marteen Jones  
marteen.g.jones@gmail.com  
25 N Broadway, Unit 202  
Tacoma, Washington 98403

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	LeeAnn Gekas	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
--	--------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          LeeAnn Gekas          dragonflygardener59@gmail.com          1149 33rd Ave NE          Olympia, Washington 98506</p>
	Liz Campbell	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Liz Campbell  zil1000campbell@gmail.com  605 n 64th street  sea, Washington 98103</p>
	Paul Ferry	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving investments with the “lowest cost”. When examining what constitutes lowest cost, the UTC must</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
 Paul Ferry  
 uncmadhatter@gmail.com  
 2417 86th st ne  
 Marysville , Washington 98271

	Dale Visinaiz	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,
--	---------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Get with it fossil fuel is destroying the planet  Thank you.Dale Visinaiz Ojibwa Native  Dale Visinaiz  Teahouse4u@gmail.com  9370 takilma rd  Cavejunction, Oregon 97523</p>
	<p>Julia Sokoloff</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you. Julia Sokoloff juliasokoloff@gmail.com 1618 Central St NE Olympia, Washington 98506</p>
	Tika Bordelon	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
 Tika Bordelon  
 tikab1@gmail.com  
 1400 Hubbell Pl  
 Seattle, Washington 98101

	David Burch	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the
--	-------------	-------	---

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.          David Burch          David Burch          elementalimpressions@gmail.com          8910 LAWNDAL E AVE SW          LAKEWOOD, Washington 98498</p>
	Richard Lovering	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Rights Commission.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Richard Lovering  fencehewer@gmail.com  3594 S D St  Tacoma, Washington 98418</p>
	Susan DeWitt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Susan DeWitt  
sedewitt4@gmail.com  
325 Twin Lake Dr  
Largo, Florida 33770

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Annemarie Dooley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  PSE throws around a lot of fancy phrases like “peak shaving”, but it is really fancy footwork to make customers pay too much. I know PSE would do this which is part of the reason I closed my account.  PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy,  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Annemarie Dooley  annemarie.dooley@gmail.com  3509 Meridian Ave N  Seattle, Washington 98103</p>
	K Anderson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
K Anderson  
andersknmedia@gmail.com  
P O Box 1934  
Milton wa, Washington 98354

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Todd H Fast	Email	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>As a retired senior over 65, my wife and I are facing many increases that are straining our fixed income budget. This is the result of this type of increase. We aren't looking for anything free, but we have to make the statement as seniors who have worked our entire lives. We live a simple life, and do our best to keep our thermostat at 68 or below, however as we age that is becoming a greater challenge as we are aging. We would suggest that some accommodation be given for seniors. It could be done on a sliding scale based on income. We are not trying to "game the system", but we know that many accommodations already are given for seniors, from bus passes to property taxes. All that is needed is a fair system based on age, income, perhaps martial status, which would take into account the challenges that those of us seniors who are facing the constant pressure of increased costs.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Todd H Fast – Appreciative Inquiry Facilitator  425-444-0236  "Creating an Alignment of Strengths Making Weaknesses Irrelevant"  <a href="https://courses.centerforappreciativeinquiry.net/directory/atfz01/">https://courses.centerforappreciativeinquiry.net/directory/atfz01/</a></p>
	m'lou christ	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) looks out for customers by approving</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
m'lou christ  
mnortie@yahoo.com  
w lk samm pkwy ne  
Redmond, Washington 98052

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Don Sutherland	Email	<p>Docket UG-230393. My name is Don Sutherland, I am almost 67 years old and recently retired, on a fixed income. My wife and I have lived in the Burien area for 24 years and in that time we have seen many changes. Some good and some bad, but most of them costly to seniors on a fixed income. After I retired and 10 months later, my wife passed away. This left me struggling with paying all of our bills with one income and we had two mortgages since we needed one of them for debt consolidation. Needless to say that the funeral and the burial were expensive also because I was paying for both of us to be interred. Any raising rates of utilities at this point would prove costly to me, in terms of surviving, and the ability to remain in My Home. I don't get much money from my retirement, but it has been enough to barely get by. Any raise of rates at this point would prove to be a burden to me financially. I am also at that fine line where unfortunately I don't qualify for Financial Assistance with utility bills. I therefore implore not to allow this rate increase to happen. If PSE feels they have enough money to build a gas facility construction in Tacoma , They should do it with the understanding that it will be paid for with the money that they currently collect. This could quite frankly impact me and others in my age group, who are retired in Burien significantly. Significant enough to possibly not only change our lifestyles but our desired future location in this area. I am sure that projects, such as this are often overlooked in terms of cost overruns, and that should not subjugate the existing customers to be penalized by additional money to pay for them. Please take my comments into careful consideration before you make your decision in this matter. Thank you very much for your time, Sincere regards, Don Sutherland.</p>
	Kathy Hewitt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for "peak shaving", which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility's use over the life of its lease. Yet</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Kathy Hewitt  
ikathyhewitt@gmail.com  
5003 Main St #304  
Tacoma, Washington 98407

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Margo Rolf	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Margo Rolf  margorolf@aol.com  29610 2nd. Pl. SW  FEDERAL WAY, Washington 98023</p>
	Harjit Singh	Email	<p>Hi.</p> <p>I'm opposed to the adjustment because it is not justified. PSE is a private company with a very high profit margin. They should invest the funds for these projects - Schedule 141LG, 141D, 141N.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Steve Williams	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Steve Williams        Prospect2125@aol.com        2125 No. Prospect        Tacoma, Washington 98406</p>
	Carol Stevens	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

“peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Carol Stevens  
animalfreak98037@yahoo.com

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>704 165th St Ct E  Spanaway, Washington 98387</p>
	<p>Brian Nelson</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  I am a Puget Sound Energy gas customer and have been for 25+ year with no option of other providers. I do not feel that it is right for captive residential customers to be forced to pay for PSE's speculation on marine fuels, particularly in a time of abundant gas supply.  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. The pollution from this facility will disproportionately</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Brian Nelson        brinelson720@gmail.com        720 South Proctor St        Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>janefrazerfrz99@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
janefrazerfrz99@hotmail.com  
201 E 63rd St  
Tacoma, Washington 98404-1204

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tristan Anderson	Email	<p>I strongly oppose PSE's proposed rate increase to help pay for the LNG facility in the Port. When the public is being asked yet once again to help pay for a facility that will ultimately disproportionately help PSE's bottom line- all I am reminded of is the typical govt mantra of helping to privatize the gains, and socialize the loses...</p> <p>Thank you- Tristan Anderson</p>
	Sally Burke	Email	Sally Burke
	Kamryn Kellogg	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Kamryn Kellogg          kamrynellogg@gmail.com          502 14th St SW          Puyallup, Washington 98371</p>
	Frances Blair	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The LNG plant should never have been approved. It must never be allowed to develop "mission creep". We should focus on eliminating our reliance on fossil fuels of all types! Residential customers should not have to pay a single penny for this mis-begotten monster!</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Frances Blair          feblair39@gmail.com          6250 North Park Avenue          Tacoma, Washington 98407</p>
	<p>Dale and Pamela Wright</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          As Pamela and I are very strongly opposed to Puget Sound Energy's Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, PSE should not be rewarded with any residential customer rate increase for the LNG facility. Please do not support and enable this egregious corporate greed.          The main purpose of the LNG facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.          The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>Please deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Dale and Pamela Wright          wright.dale69@gmail.com          7917 35th St. W.          University Place, Washington 98466</p>
	Sunny Fievez	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Sunny Fievez  sfievez@yahoo.com  10423 Rainier Ridge Blvd E, Apt F102  Puyallup, Washington 98374</p>
	Kelly Broussard	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Kelly Broussard  kjbroussard@rocketmail.com  13302 55th Ave NW  Gig Harbor, Washington 98332</p>
	John Corso	Email	Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.

The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Thank you.  John Corso  jcorso695@gmail.com  701 N J St  Tacoma , Washington 98403</p>
	<p>King Schoenfeld</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  I feel strongly that Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  I've read the case: The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. Approving reimbursement for infrastructure that will run on fracked gas must consider the costs to humans and environment related to fracking.  The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.  PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in energy efficiency, energy storage, time-varying rates, demand response</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>and other measures that would accelerate the transition to clean energy, as well as improve reliability and lower customer costs. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.  The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you and I trust you will do the right thing for all of us, the public.  King Schoenfeld  basileus@swbell.net  1617 Division Ave #3  Tacoma, Washington 98403</p>
	Linda Hood	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.  The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.  The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Linda Hood  hoodwhite2@gmail.com  2003 88th Ave W 8547  University Place, Washington 98466</p>
	Ben Comstock	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Ben Comstock  
s3rv3pk@gmail.com  
10920 62nd Ave E  
Puyallup, Washington 98373

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Rheya Wren	Email	<p>Docket UG-230393 ratepayer hikes for petrochemical combustion expansion ratepayer funding Deny the requested rate increase for recovering construction costs of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas refinery</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service today to the community, I first started submitting public comment to the WA UTC nearly a decade ago, consistently asking for swift action on climate change, infrastructure transition, and the shifting off of the greenhouse gases inherent to PSE's base fuel mix of combustion for energy. In that time, the base fuel mix for PSE's default users has barely budged from its 60% petrochemical baseline. The window for "bridge fuels" ended 15 years ago.</p> <p>Washington state has set clear, bold, policy roadmaps, and legislation to address climate change and to negate our petrochemical footprint. We've clearly highlighted the demand for zero emission drawdown and the halt to petrochemical infrastructure expansion. When the highly controversial Tacoma LNG facility was marketed to the public space, it was sold as a "maritime transition expansion off of dirty bunker fuels."</p> <p>This for-profit expansion and corporate investment was never intended for ratepayer use. The burden of poorly planned corporate petrochemical profits is being placed on those least able to afford or pay these volatile market increases, especially as more extreme weather and polar vortex instability pushes their bills into the hundreds already in winter.</p> <p>As someone who has already shifted off of majority petrochemical fuels to create a carbon neutral, highly efficient home. This rate increase isn't going to register much to me on my bill, but it will hurt my neighbors, both in their home bills and in their changing home environment. Let the maritime industry cover the infrastructure expansion of the maritime industry...they might see slightly lower profits, but it would be the fair way to assess the investment costs to the actual source and use.</p> <p>If you are ruling in favor of leveling the for-profit market expansion on ratepayers...regardless of climate impacts to methane production, transport, and leak rates...I'd instead ask in those circumstances that we increase the methane costs in alignment with the additional known social costs to the public (as set my regional and global cross-border assessment). Let the public truly see the social harm of these fuels within their bills, so they can begin to shift off in their upgrades. Ask PSE to take into account now, the costs and planning of known in-coming global Cross Border</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Adjustments costs for carbon and methane on electricity within their cost analysis and rate-setting. <a href="https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism_en">https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism_en</a> Taxpayers shouldn't have to keep footing the bill for petrochemical company harm and "denial by delay" tactics of the petrochemical for-profit industries. Taxpayers should not be continually required to subsidize this known self-harm. Alternative options exist and for \$300 million we could have been a whole lot further down the transition road off methane.</p> <p><a href="https://globaltaxnews.ey.com/news/2023-0925-final-regulations-published-for-new-eu-carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism-cbam-and-eu-emission-trading-system-revisions-cbam-transition-period-begins-1-october-2023">https://globaltaxnews.ey.com/news/2023-0925-final-regulations-published-for-new-eu-carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism-cbam-and-eu-emission-trading-system-revisions-cbam-transition-period-begins-1-october-2023</a></p> <p><a href="https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism_en">https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/carbon-border-adjustment-mechanism_en</a></p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention,</p> <p>Rheya Wren (she/they) M: 206-931-7052 @ClimateHawk2 RheyaWren@gmail.com Previously Rachel Molloy</p>
	Linda	Email	<p>PSE built the LGN plant by their own decision. People in Tacoma were opposed. They trashed over Indian disrespecting Treaties and they will be utilizing fracked gas which damages the land itself. And I am sure there are other issues.</p> <p>PSE should bare the LGN total cost out of their profits. They should bare total responsibility for their chosen actions.</p> <p>Personally, I used to have respect for PSE but that has diminished significantly due to their actions in building the LGN plant.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

Theresa Turnrt	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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. The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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. PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p>
----------------	-------	--

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.  Theresa Turnrt  tmteach@aol.com  25009 171st Avenue SE  Covington , Washington 98042</p>
	<p>Dr. Lauri Lindquist</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,  Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Dr. Lauri Lindquist          lauri.lindquist@gmail.com          4328 S Park Ave          TACOMA, Washington 98418</p>
	Tara Dietz	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Tara Dietz        taradietz08@gmail.com        5707 97th Avenue Ct W        University Place, Washington 98467</p>
	Jennifer Hoadley	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jennifer Hoadley

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>ddjennifer65@gmail.com        824 S L St, #3        Tacoma, Washington 98405</p>
	<p>Jennea Wood</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.        The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.        The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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.        The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>Rights Commission.          PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.          The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.          Jennea Wood          jennea.wood@gmail.com          505 Central St NE          Olympia, Washington 98506</p>
	<p>Jeniffer Scitern</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,          First I want to say that LNG plant is seriously dangerous to the community that is within 2- 3 miles of that plant. If it leaked or exploded ot would be fatal for a large number of golks who live and work in that radius of this LNG unstable plant. Think of an earthquake, or flood. I object intensely to this burden being placed on the backs of Tacoma tax payers. Stop gouging!!!!          Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.          The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.          The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, including likely future costs related to sea level rise, deadly heat</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

waves, droughts, worsening wildfire seasons, and the human health costs related to these events. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE's past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
Jeniffer Scitern  
Jeniffer Scitern  
jeniffer769@gmail.com  
4527 South Yakima Ave  
Tacoma, Washington 98418



Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

	Kathy	Email	<p>I am not able to attend due to my employment.</p> <p>Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment: There is not enough information to respond, however, 3.45% is more than I think should be paid given all the utility rate hikes that have happened this year.</p> <p>Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recover: who gets the 85.05% hike...yikes!</p> <p>Kathy PSE customer</p>
	Gerald Iyall	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission , Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment.</p> <p>The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			<p>birth defects.</p> <p>The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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 is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.</p> <p>The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.</p> <p>Thank you.        Gerald Iyall        infill.doorway-0e@icloud.com        3412 Orbit PL SE        Olympia, Washington 98501</p>
	d robinson	Email	<p>Utilities_and_Transportation_Commission ,        Puget Sound Energy (PSE) should not receive any residential customer rate increase for the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility.</p> <p>The main purpose of this facility is for maritime fuel, not to provide residential services. PSE claims that for the first ten years of use, the facility will be available for residential customers for “peak shaving”, which would provide backup power, a few days a year, during the highest times of demand. However, the demand for peak shaving has not been proven, is a projection put together by PSE, and would only account for about 2% of the facility’s use over the life of its lease. Yet PSE is trying to recover 43% of the construction costs, forcing residential customers to pay for</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

something they will barely use, if at all. This is not a prudent investment. The Utilities and Transportation Commission (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, 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. 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 & Murdered Indigenous Women near pipeline construction and man camps; health impacts to nearby communities such as cancer and birth defects.

The Tacoma LNG facility is a prime example of environmental injustice. Construction began two years prior to PSE obtaining the proper permits, despite opposition from the Puyallup Tribe and amidst massive public outcry. The Puyallup Tribe and Earthjustice are still appealing the permits for this controversial facility in court. 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.

PSE is heavily entrenched in the gas industry and without intervention will continue to invest in infrastructure that enriches itself instead of enriching the lives of its customers. PSE is not investing sufficiently in 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. Many of PSE’s past projects have been vigorously opposed by residential customers.

The UTC needs to deny the requested rate increase and hold PSE accountable to a higher standard.

Thank you.  
d robinson  
dlrobinson66@yahoo.com  
PO Box 151  
Curlew, Washington 99118-0151

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
Undecided	Dominic Venice	E-mail	<p>Hello,  I will not be able to make the hearing on 11/1/23 at 6pm. I have a few comments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this rate increase just for residents? Or are you including businesses and corporations into this rate increase as well?</li> <li>• If businesses and corporations will have a rate increase, how much will it be compared to the residential increase? My suggestion is it should be equal % or greater for businesses and corporations.</li> <li>• What is the benefit for residents that PSE invested all this money into a liquified natural gas facility? Basically, I am asking what justifies the rate increase? They way I understand it, only businesses and corporations will benefit from this investment.</li> <li>• Why wouldn't this investment into this facility be absorbed by PSE? Such as a standard reinvestment into improving their own company. Last year I believe the company made around \$250M... Why can't they adsorb some of this investment instead of making us residents pay it back? Especially if there is no real benefit to the customers.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for allowing me to provide comments!</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ivan	E-mail	<p>to whom it may concern,</p> <p>can i learn if the said Tacoma LNG facility supplies natural gas to my service area- Issaquah WA 98029?  if so the rate increase may be related.  then my follow-up question is how to assure the rate increase is fairly distributed to the service area users.</p> <p>of course if not, what then may be the rationale for rate hike?</p> <p>thanks  Ivan</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Luckisha Phillips	Web	<p>For this: Schedule 141LNG Liquefied Natural Gas Rate Adjustment: An overall increase in natural gas rates of 3.45% to collect the costs incurred for the construction and development of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility.</p> <p>Why not charge those in the Tacoma area? Is there a reason everyone has to pay.</p> <p>This:  Schedule 141D Distribution Pipeline Provisional Recovery Adjustment: Overall no change in natural gas rates to collect costs incurred for the construction of four miles of distribution pipe. One transportation rate schedule will see a rate increase of 85.05% while sales rate schedules will see a rate decrease of 0.08%.</p> <p>85%!!!! This should also share the cost per household or additional information in the impact. How does one prepare for this change and not feel accosted? Can this be gradual over time?</p> <p>This:  Schedule 141N Rates Not Subject to Refund Rate Adjustment: An overall increase in natural gas rates of 0.08% for the recovery of costs approved during a multiyear rate plan that are not subject to refund.</p> <p>So we are paying for it later, after an economic crisis. When things are worst than before? Was this any participator budget process? Was there a majority customer voice in this process? Grants or talking with the state?</p>

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments:** 756  
**In Favor:** 3  
**Opposed:** 747  
**Undecided:** 6

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	David NMN Burg	Web	Docket UG-230393  Already heavily discounted prices for commercial and transportation should not be excluded from participating to the increase, in the spirit of fairness. On the contrary, legacy natural gas discount for transportation should be gradually rolled back to be replaced with modern technologies having a smaller carbon footprint. While natural gas is preferable to oil burning, it is no longer a priority as electric vehicles have achieved sufficient progress to exceed the environmental benefits, especially for intensive and predictable use transportation.
	Alex Peter-Contesse	Web	Reference Docket UG-230393 1. Why are Transportation customers (who already pay less than half the rate of Residential customers) excluded from the rate increase? 2. Why do Residential customers pay 30 times the rate of "Special Contracts"?
	Thomas Campbell	Web	The increase of 3.5% that I was notified on. Can you comment if this increase is because of required increases for Climate Change policies instituted by the state government?
Yes			
	Michael starrett	Web	I support this reasonable rate increase. I do not agree with the government's attack on this industry.
	joyce moran	Web	I'm in favor of the rate hike. It's not excessive, and we need to support infrastructure. Too many people complain about anything that costs money.

Case: 230393

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

**Total Comments: 756**

**In Favor: 3**

**Opposed: 747**

**Undecided: 6**

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nicholas George	Email	<p>In reference toDocket UG-230393, I Nicholas George of Burien Washington am in full support if the LNG infrastructure enhancement and the increased billing required for the infrastructure required for LNG services. As a reliable and clean energy source to compliment other forms of energy, LNG companies need to enhance or maintain infrastructure. I am in support of PSE raising rates or tariffs or taxes to build up the tacoma LNG clean energy facility.</p> <p>Nicholas George            2826 sw 170th street            Burien, wa 98166</p>