

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

For an Accounting Order Authorizing
Accounting Treatment Related to Payments
for Major Maintenance Activities

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

Respondent.

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

For an Accounting Order Authorizing
Accounting the Sale of the Water Rights and
Associated Assets of the Electron
Hydroelectric Project in Accordance with
WAC 480-143 and RCW 80.12

In the Matter of the Application of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

For an Order Authorizing the Sale of
Interests in the Development Assets
Required for the Construction and Operation
of Phase II of the Lower Snake River Wind
Facility

DOCKET UE-130583

DOCKET UE-130617

DOCKET UE-131099

DOCKET UE-131230


OFFER OF PUBLIC COMMENT
EXHIBIT NO. BR-2

1. Public Counsel hereby offers this Public Comment Exhibit No. BR-2 for admission into the record of the proceeding.
2. Public Comment Exhibit No BR-2. The exhibit consists of e-mails, and other written materials submitted by the public commenting on the Puget Sound Energy PCORC et al. cases, dockets UE-130583, UE-130617, UE-131099 and UE-131230. These letters and materials were submitted to the Commission and are attached hereto.
3. The Commission recorded three public comments, two via e-mail and one through the internet, for which there are no original hard copies to submit. Commission Consumer Protection and Communications Staff entered these comments into a database, which includes all comments received by the Commission. Text of the comments was directly input into the database. The output from this database has been included in as an attachment to this document and provides all comments submitted to the Commission.
4. The submitted material has been counted as follows:

<u>Comments received by WUTC</u>	
Opposing the rate increase	3
Supporting the rate increase	0
Undecided comments	0
5. Public Counsel submits a total of three (3) public comments in the exhibit, all of which oppose the rate increase.
6. No comments were submitted to Public Counsel regarding these dockets.

7. DATED this 3rd day of October, 2013.

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General



Simon J. Fitch
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Public Counsel Division

**Attachment to Offer of Public Comment
PSE PCORC et al.
UE-130583, UE-130617, UE-131099, & UE-131230**

Total Comments: 3

In Favor: 0

Opposed: 3

Undecided: 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No	Denis Ganey	E-mail	<p>Puget Energy is now privately held and we consumers seem to have no way to evaluate the merits of any increase request.</p> <p>It seems they can just take from us at will. Are you able to follow their corporate profit trail? Do you see where funds are siphoned to the larger holding company? Who is looking out for the consumer interest? How do we know?</p> <p>ARE YOU KIDDING ME???</p> <p>I just read our local newspaper and see that PSE is AGAIN asking for an increase in electricity, beginning November 2013. WE JUST HAD AN INCREASE in both electric and gas power. Is this a damn joke?? I am so irritated I can't even see straight....and it doesn't matter that the request is a small percentage, it is still an increase. And what the "h" are "power supplies" that this ridiculous company seeks to recover. This is just beyond understanding, and the UTC should absolutely deny it!</p>
	Ilene James	E-mail	<p>I live in Olalla, Washington. Since your approval of Puget Sound Energy's rate increase we have expwrianced our second power outage. Both times the weather was marginal with winds to 20 mph. Your last rate approval gave the Company additional funds to cover their cost for maintenance. As one paying one of the highest rates in the State it is my belief we should have one of the most reliable systems. In my area there are outdated conducters that will break from a small tree branch. The WUTC reviews data for the protection of consumers in Washington. It seems they are a organization that instead ensures profits for a private utility. Why does a Public Power Company adjacent to Olalla have less outages and much cheaper rates than Puget Energy? The only thing that I can think of is profits. Maybe Olalla should be serviced by a Public Utility. Someone that can manage their funds. It seems Puget Energy is unable to since their main concern is the stock holders.</p>
	joe serka	Web	

Case: 130617

Title: PSE PCORP

PI Coordinator:

Kouchi, Roger

Staff Lead: Christopher Mickelson

Public Comments by Case