

## Public Comments by Case

**Total Comments:** 24

**In Favor:** 0

**Opposed:** 19

**Undecided:** 5

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Jerry Votendahl	E-mail	In response to your notification of public hearing on clean energy—please take a look at the document renewed by some 1600 scientists that tell us that we are not in any Climate Crisis nor is C02 responsible for Climate Change. Do your home work and history will tell you that mother nature is responsible for Climate Change and man has nothing to do with it. Also, go outside and you will discover no such Climate crisis. You know that Green energy is not capable without fossil fuels to satisfy the energy needs of our country. Stand up and object. Jerry Votendahl
	Randy Bauman	E-mail	<p>I am 100% opposed to anything you claim is 'clean energy' updates. All that occurs for the customer is higher charges, less service and things that only appease the environmental agenda. Washington has the cleanest, most economical, and renewable energy in the northwest -- hydroelectric power!</p> <p>The so-called clean energy from wind is only available now because of federal subsidies. When those end, so does that energy source. The wind energy does not provide enough energy to pay for itself...every time customers are offered an option to purchase that power, it costs significantly more than my current hydro power. And, no one is addressing that you purchase the towers and blades from foreign countries that don't even support us and those carbon fibre monsters will never biodegrade and can't be disposed of or recycled.</p> <p>How about doing what is right for customers and farmers. Upgrade and improve our dams, not breach them. Upgrade and improve our nuclear options at Hanford...the resources are already there.</p> <p>Do not continue down this 'save the planet' path that only costs the end user more money monthly and makes foreign countries who do care about the environment richer.</p> <p>Randy Bauman</p>

			An Unhappy End User
	John Harris	E-mail	<p>Reading your Aug. 25 letter detailing how you plan to go green was an unpleasant experience.</p> <p>If you were serious, you'd be talking natural gas and nuclear. Instead, you're promoting strip mining the earth and using slave labor in China for solar panels. We're bracing ourselves for less reliable, more expensive power and despoilation of the environment because of the climate change hysteria.</p> <p>This climate nonsense goes on while the people who bray about it the most fly private jets, live in mansions and push Democrat policies like wealth redistribution and control over the masses.</p> <p>Second Nobel Prize Winner Signs Letter With 1,600 Scientists Declaring Climate 'Emergency' A Myth  <a href="https://thefederalist.com/2023/09/01/second-nobel-prize-winner-signs-letter-with-1600-scientists-declaring-climate-emergency-a-myth/">https://thefederalist.com/2023/09/01/second-nobel-prize-winner-signs-letter-with-1600-scientists-declaring-climate-emergency-a-myth/</a></p>
	Samuel Dickerson	E-mail	<p>Dear WA Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>My name is Samuel Dickerson. I'm a residential power customer of Pacific Power in Yakima, WA.</p> <p>I do not support Pacific Powers' Clean Energy Implementation Plan!</p> <p>"Clean energy" plans often include nebulous goals surrounding the theory of climate change.</p> <p>Cost of living is the number one concern for consumers.</p> <p>Affordability MUST be the number one priority of electric utilities, not climate change!</p> <p>Families like mine are worried about affordability.</p> <p>Affordability is deteriorating across the region. Here in the Yakima Valley, we've seen increased rents and other cost concerns in recent years.</p> <p>Cost of living is the number one concern for customers, it should be the number one concern for utilities.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Samuel Dickerson</p>
	Darin Brown	E-mail	I received your letter about the public hearing and I had to laugh. I am pretty confident that any comments from citizens are just going to be basically ignored because I feel you will simply listen to dollars and government and

			<p>not actual citizens. Your version of clean energy is too costly and unnecessary as it will cause more harm than good. No one can afford your suggestions to put solar on our homes. I would put some at my home if I could afford it but you then would take the power from me and then charge me to use it.</p> <p>Solar panels only help the consumer if it is accompanied with batteries as well to store the power for our personal use. THEN we would not have any use for the grid.</p> <p>The truly clean power comes from hydro power which the dams seem to be on the chopping block as well. Seems a little backwards.</p> <p>Anyway, my comment, ask the government to stay out of our homes and let us live free. Worry less about clean power and look into power that is more efficient. Stop taking away from us and allow us to live comfortably and free. We used to do this, but for some reason we are not able to anymore.</p> <p>-- Darin Brown</p>
	Keith Schlemlein	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Stop it! Just Stop it. All you are going to do I drive out electricity rates through the roof and achieve absolutely nothing that effects climate change. This is a fools errand. Wind and solar are not reliable. We need energy plants that aren't dependent on if the wind blows or the sun shines. They are crazy expensive and it is wishful thinking to imagine that you can achieve any of this by 2030. Build gas fired electric plants and modern nuclear plants and make energy less expensive not more. Cheap energy is the way out of poverty not expensive energy.</p> <p>Keith Schlemlein</p>
	Malcolm Arnett	E-mail	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>I received a letter today from Pacific Power concerning making a comment to the Transportation Commission to have their plan approved to meet the goals set by the Washington Clean Energy Transformation Act. According to their letter, the “objectives include ensuring that 100% of all retail sales of electricity are greenhouse-gas-neutral by 2030, and sourcing 100% of power from non-emitting or renewable energy generation by 2045”.</p> <p>Fortunately, at my age, I won’t be around to see these new standards implemented. The Equity Advisory Group, are like most equity based groups, believe they can control the environment through their “equity” plan that’s suppose fit everyone equally. It’s much like the folks who say all fossil fuels will be ended by 2030. It’s won’t happen. Most of know that it’s a control issue and a way that the elites, not only want to control us, but to raise the</p>

			<p>cost on every day Americans.</p> <p>Pacific Power has to buy into this “equity” plan, and like the Equity Advisory Group, go along with this phony Marxists program.</p> <p>Malcolm Arnett</p>
	Ira Johnson	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>I’m against making such a drastic change. We need to keep ALL energy plans running. All you have to do is look at California. They can’t keep the lights on. Look at Germany they did away with natural gas and it was a huge mistake. Solar and wind are not the answer. You should look for nuclear and hydro power. They are the answer</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Dale and Jean Henry	E-mail	<p>As a residential utility customer of Pacific Power and registered voter in the state of Washington, I am OPPOSED to "ensuring that 100% of all retail sales of electricity are greenhouse-gas-neutral by 2030, and sourcing 100% of power from non-emitting or renewable energy generation by 2045".</p> <p>Because of this nonsense to eliminate use of ALL fossil fuels and follow a "sky is falling" type cult of climate change chaos, core inflation climbed excessively since January 20, 2021 with the current USA Presidential administration. We went from an energy independent to energy dependent nation. Core Inflation, which excludes the volatility of food and energy prices (where most people feel the inflationary pinch) has been around 4.7% (2021), 8.0% (2022) and 4.3% (2023).</p> <p>Coupled with more nonsense about removing the Snake River Dams (which will result in substantially decreased renewable energy generation through hydropower and higher costs due to flooding and barging wheat to the west coast, we are headed for economic disaster.</p> <p>Please look at economics and the future of our nation in resisting senseless policies such as those currently being pursued.</p>
	Connie Upton	E-mail	<p>I am writing today to oppose the Pacific Powers plan. My power bill for this year (August -July) has increased 26% compared to last year. I would suggest you look at their P&amp;L and see how much they took to the bottom line. They made \$16.824 BILLION in 2022.</p> <p>I cannot keep up with their increases. I would imagine many others cannot.</p>

			<p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Connie Upton Yakima Washington</p>
	Frank Hendrix	Web	<p>In reviewing literature and the PPL website it appears they are not claiming hydroelectric power generation as being renewable. They are claiming a need to increase rates for conversion from fossil fuel to renewable.</p> <p>Washington, because of hydro, is not in the situation where conversion is needed. I urge the UTC to reject all rate increases dealing with this hoax conversion. Hydro is as renewable as physically possible and making PNW rate payers pay for energy going to CA is terrible.</p>
	Ron Hartley	Web	<p>We currently have the cleanest and most economical electrical power in the country. With the recent Federal up coming changes, this will immediately raise our power rates significantly. For what, not cleaner electricity, just more costly. WE are NOT California, but with these Federal changes we'll become the next CA of the northwest. CLTA is another scheme that will more than likely double our power rates. "LEAVE WA POWER ALONE" before you screw it up so badly it can't be fixed. The timeline for these changes is absolutely ridiculous, you wanting to make huge changes in less than 7 years. NO WAY! This administration is so fixated on Carbon Neutral, how are we to breath oxygen, isn't oxygen dependent on CO2? Yet this administration want to eliminate CO2, only a fool believes these types of changes. Destroy or state because of a hair brain idea... I say NO.</p>
	Dennis Cimino	Web	<p>First, notification about the agenda for this energy plan is so vague and ill-defined, that at best it's merely 'virtue signaling' and at worst, it's just 'hot air' that means the actual voters (hahahahaha!) and energy users (more hahahahahahah!) actually have a voice.</p> <p>Let's face it, this moron governor isn't qualified to sign 'toilet paper requisitions' for the bathrooms in Olympia, let alone a 'law' that determines how this moron state gets it's Energy from.</p> <p>I'm not an adherent to this 'climb on it, gimme all yer change' b.s. going on. Earth has gone thru several temperature extremes in BOTH directions long before a single human being existed here, yet idiots in government use this false and fraudulent agenda to destroy the energy independence of the entire nation. This is not only 'criminally cynical' but it's disgustingly pathetic and ill-conceived.</p> <p>When any of the board of Pacific Power or for that matter, the morons in the State of Washington's sorry pathetic government can show me a cogent and sane plan to not only provide energy independence for this moron toilet (WA), but also not cause profound energy outages and hardships, I'm all ears. Unfortunately this is not going to happen in my friggin lifetime. Virtue signal something that actually is backed by science, instead of 'seyence' and 'b.s.', then contact me to comment.</p>

			Let's face it, the average State of Washington moron in government has the science background of a garden slug. The're the LAST ONES who should be involved in sane, cogent, and reasonable legislation towards the goal of making this State more energy flexible and stable. You guys get ZERO vote of confidence from me. Sorry, not buying.
	Roger & Marylen Korando	Web	Having been customers of Pacific Power for over 30 years, it becomes easy to criticize this insane costly energy conservation proposal being put forward. Efforts in the past have only resulted in increased rates and taxes, They are destroying our beautiful environment with these ugly wind machines which are also killing, on a wholesale basis, endangered birds in our area. For what, so we can send the pittance of energy that they produce to California??. We as customers have certainly not seen any financial advantages to their presence. We can only hope and pray that soon we will be blessed with legislators and a governor who has enough common sense to rescind these insane and unreasonable intrusions in our freedoms in order to satisfy the environmental whacho's who seem to be now controlling our lives.
	Steven J Trujillo	Web	Im against any and all new green proposals. What this administration is doing is making China richer, and moving American jobs overseas or just eliminating them and leaving our work force without jobs. Seems that the Socialist are trying to make America a communist country.  Stop listening to YOUR high dollar doners and listen to the public that Loves America
	Sandra Collins	Web	DOCKET UE-210829 SEPTEMBER 28, 2023 Submitted by Sandra J. Collins, Yakima Washington. September 2023 Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns.  I am dismayed at the rush to move to “green” power sources. The following comments reflect my views as shared to and by the Cornwall Alliance earlier this year. Sometime in the future makes more sense than rushing into a system that is far more costly and risky for millions of people, and is still constantly evolving. These comments also apply to the Pacific Power system as well as the TVA system noted in the comments. The following was copied from Cornwall Alliance email posted by E. Calvin Beisner August 28, 2023 “When in June of this year the Cornwall Alliance offered to send Robert Bryce’s book A Question of Power: Electricity and the Wealth of Nations free as our thanks when people donated, one donor, Thomas J. Myers, responded with a note we just had to share. He writes from experience within the electric power industry. With his permission, here’s what he said. It’s a message millions need to hear and take seriously.” “Thanks for communicating to folks the importance of knowing how our electricity gets to our homes and businesses. I’m just an old country guy who grew up in the sticks in Middle TN. I know hard times as we didn’t have indoor plumbing until 1963, when I was 11. Having worked at TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) for more than 29 years (1977–2006), and all of that being in the construction or modification of our power plants (including nuclear, fossil, gas, and diesel), I am amazed when I talk to folks who don’t understand that windmills and solar panels cannot produce the amounts of electricity that are currently required to maintain our infrastructure.

			<p>Unfortunately, there are even a significant number of TVA employees (mostly administrative types) who have no clue as to what is required to put power on the grid and then how that power gets distributed to the end users. While I was there (well into my career), TVA hired a consultant who taught some classes to employees who were either curious about that process or needed to understand it better. The class took the students from the very beginning of the production process to the meter on your house or business.</p> <p>Most of the people were absolutely blown away by the complexity of that process. I recommended that the class be taught to everyone employed or hired so they could at least have some knowledge that could be passed on to family, neighbors, and friends when someone asked them what they did. TVA did not act on that recommendation, and consequently, they still have a large percentage of employees who do not understand the system at all. There is still so much misinformation out there! And people don't understand that, while usage is less at night than in the day, a large percentage of the load on the grid still exists overnight. They think that, because they turn off their lights and other electronic devices when they go to bed, power is not largely needed. However, the loads are still significant enough to prevent turning down many of the generating plants. They don't realize that much of the industry is still operating at night, along with their heat and air, charging stations for their electronic devices (in some cases their cars), and hospitals. These and other user needs still have to be met.</p> <p>I suppose people will better understand the picture when the power starts failing when the temperatures are in the upper 90s or low teens. Many in our area don't realize that, despite California's push for battery-operated cars, the state has several times mandated that people not recharge them at night and sometimes for longer periods. Maybe someday we will get there, but its likely decades in the future, as best I can see, for it depends on much more costly infrastructure (such as dependable and much larger battery storage capabilities, especially for harnessing solar) that doesn't currently exist.</p> <p>I guess we will all just sit around in the dark when the grid takes a nosedive, because kerosene lamps and candles must (based on the climate alarmists' projections) have a significant effect on global warming!"</p>
	Catherine Anderson	Web	<p>Docket # UE-210829. There is no climate emergency. Studies by eminently qualified scientists, journalists and others are being omitted from the Public Dialogue. This does not serve our best interests. Ex: read the World Climate Declaration signed by 1,688 people including Nobel Prize Winner Dr. John Clauser (Clintel.org) Large entities, corporate/utilities/media have jumped into this issue without sufficient participation of other viewpoints which present authentic data. It is always easier to "push through" unilaterally. Consequences of this will fall to us down the road. By committing to the Policy you've presented in your recent US Mail communication, we the People and our Nation will pay a high price. Thank you.</p>
	Jim Davison	Web	<p>August 4, 2023</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</p> <p>RE: Pacific Power Notice of Proposed Rate Change</p>

			<p>“Located in southeast Washington state between the Tri-Cities and Lewiston, Idaho, the dams collectively produce an average of 900 megawatts of zero-carbon energy each year, according to a study commissioned by the Bonneville Power Administration.” Source: <a href="https://www.thecentersquare.com/washington/article_8dbd3e78-3254-11ee-803a-bf63e0eaf395.html">https://www.thecentersquare.com/washington/article_8dbd3e78-3254-11ee-803a-bf63e0eaf395.html</a></p> <p>In spite of the fact that power produced by the Snake River dams is “zero-carbon energy”, that energy—contrary to what is taught/learned in science classes—is NOT considered as “renewable” according to RCW 19.285.030, Definitions, Section (12): “Eligible renewable resource” means: (a) Electricity from a generation facility powered by a renewable resource other than freshwater that commences operation after March 31, 1999 . . . .” This definition effectively eliminates any water flowing through ALL dams on the Snake and Columbia rivers from being considered a “renewable resource”.</p> <p>Water through existing dams are further discriminated against in the “Energy conservation and renewable energy targets” of RCW 19.285.040, (2)(a): Except as provided in (j) of this subsection, each qualifying utility shall use eligible renewable resources or acquire equivalent renewable energy credits, or any combination of them, to meet the following annual targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) At least three percent of its load by January 1, 2012, and each year thereafter through December 31, 2015;</li> <li>(ii) At least nine percent of its load by January 1, 2016, and each year thereafter through December 31, 2019; and</li> <li>(iii) At least fifteen percent of its load by January 1, 2020, and each year thereafter.</li> </ul> <p>The requirement of RCW 19.285.040, (2)(a) gives an unfair advantage to solar- and wind-generated power at the expense of “zero-carbon energy” created by the dams on the Columbia and Snake rivers. This requirement is causing an increase in costs to consumers of electricity in Washington State as seen nearly every year in requests by utilities to increase rates.</p> <p>Why is such discrimination and favoritism tolerated at the expense of energy consumers in Washington State? It is sincerely hoped that those laws favoring solar and wind power—at the expense of “zero-carbon energy” produced by dams—will be reversed to allow free market pricing/regulation.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jim Davison PO Box 425 Waitsburg, WA 99361-0425</p>
	Peter Marinace	Web	Comments typed by Sam Cooper during call to the CP hotline: Consumers shouldn't be put in this position. The requirements of the law are too difficult for say, Pacific Power to ensure 99% reliability. It's too much pressure on

			<p>them. It's too aggressive of a plan and I would like to avoid rolling blackouts. The infrastructure is not in place.</p> <p><b>**This consumer also wants to speak with Public Involvement and a phone message to Andrew Roberts will be sent over shortly.**</b></p> <p>Customer has two concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The customer wants more transparency in bills, how much of the bill is due to CETA, how much it due to cap and trade.</li> <li>2) Customer doesn't want funding of energy assistance to be mandatory, they want the funding to be voluntary.</li> </ol>
<b>Undecided</b>			
	Henry Charvet	E-mail	<p>September 11,2023</p> <p>REF: Docket UE-210829</p> <p>I installed solar in 2013. Ten years ago. In the summer months my bill usage is minimal. Generating more power than I use!</p> <p>But, I lose my extra power to the electric company, which is Pacific Power and Light.</p> <p>As I age everything is becoming more expensive I would like to BANK my extra power for the winter months. How do I make this happen? Thinking this would also encourage more people to invest in solar if it was Banked.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Henry Charvet</p>
	Alan Feistner and Rebecca Lund	E-mail	<p>Thank you to Pacific Power for the notification I received in the mail last week. My thoughts on the clean energy transformation act are the following:</p> <p>FIRST, we support clean energy when decisions are made based on clearly stated and generally accepted facts and assumptions. For example, at present, there is a body of activists who desire to remove the Snake River dams,...and who are stating simply the dams can be removed and wind energy will readily make up the difference...and furthermore, fish populations will quickly return to similar numbers from the time of Lewis and Clark in the early 19th century. Without hydropower, how will we integrate wind generated power onto the grid without increasing carbon production? Or until we have economic battery storage, what will we do when the wind doesn't blow? And why would we remove four dams that have fish passage for adults moving upstream and juveniles downstream? What about fish passage at Idaho Power or other dams w/o any fish passage that prevent access to greater habitat? What about a century or more of other fish habitat degradation and increasingly challenging ocean conditions? These issues must be discussed factually and without ignoring the second and third order effects of eliminating</p>

			<p>hydropower from the Snake River dams in the Pacific Northwest.</p> <p>The Governor Inslee and Senator Murray report makes it clear that before there is any further discussion of removing dams, there are a number of extensive and expensive steps required to ensure the economic well being of the Pacific Northwest. Replacing carbon free hydropower generation is one of those steps, as is improving road and rail infrastructure. My point is the commission should take a stand that to meet the 2030 and 2045 goals, it must stand firm that key actions cannot happen without first having factual, transparent discussions. Do not be satisfied with over simplified statements about how easy it will be to remove hydropower and still achieve out-year carbon free goals and significantly increase native fish populations.</p> <p>SECOND, if we're going to reduce the burden on "vulnerable populations," state clearly who will carry that burden and how much that burden will be to future middle class' power bills. We are a middle class family with house payments, vehicle maintenance expenses (our cars are 2004 &amp; 2006), etc., and we are already burdened with higher phone, broadband, un- and under-insured auto, and numerous other miscellaneous taxes to support folks who others perceive cannot afford such services on their own. These ever increasing "add-ons" impact middle class finances, our ability to save for rainy day expenses, our ability to save for retirement, our ability to pay for our kids education, etc. We increasingly perceive these taxes and fees to help others are now making us vulnerable. Please do not assume adding yet more fees on our future power bills to help others will not unduly impact the middle class who are striving to keep finances out of the red.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Alan Feistner Rebecca Lund</p>
	Bonnie Brickey	Web	Having looked at Washingtons Clean Energy Transformation Act and the Environmental Health Disparities Map the only conclusion I come to is that it has so many requirements (some laughable) that any plan will simply result in higher power rates as we will be depending on unreliable power and wind. They are doing their best to supply power and still meet unreasonable requirements set by the state. Good luck to them and to us their customers.
	Jill Gardiner	Web	As usual the company has conveniently left off the details of this clean energy implementation plan and how this will impact customers. You have renewable energy already that is clean: the dams.
	Eric Knievel	Web	I strongly object to utilities operating in WA state that spend millions on lobbying efforts yet complain bitterly about making the necessary upgrades to grid infrastructure and grid inter-connection efforts and, all the while, concealing how much renewable energy is curtailed. Virtual Power Plants are in the public interest as they enhance safety, security and reliability.