

Docket No. UE-210795 - Vol. II

**In the Matter of Puget Sound Energy's Clean Energy
Implementation Plan**

January 24, 2023



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
 Puget Sound Energy's Clean)
 Energy Implementation Plan) Docket: UE-210795
 Pursuant to WAC 480-100-640)
)
)
)

* VIDEOCONFERENCE *

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING
VOLUME II

Pages 36-85

January 24, 2023

6:03 p.m.

* All participants appeared via videoconference *

REPORTED BY: Tia B. Reidt, Washington RPR, CCR 2798
Oregon # 22-0001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:

RYAN SMITH
KRISTEN JENKINS
ANDREW ROBERTS
DAVE DANNER
MILT DOUMIT
ANN RENDAHL
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast
Lacey, WA 98503
(360) 664-1160
Ryan.smith@utc.wa.gov

COMMENTS BY: PAGE:

Nora Rainwater 10
Frank Damiano 12
Karen Klein 13
Peter Werner 15
Jim Lazar 17
Pete Weymiller 20
Aubrey Newton 23
James Adcock 27
Brian Grunkemeyer 30
Gary Lindahl 33
Adrian Falla 34
Kathy Brenniman 39
Devon Kellogg 45
Richard Leeds 47

* * * * *

1 Tuesday, January 24, 2023

2 6:03 p.m.

3 -o0o-

4

5 P R O C E E D I N G S

6

7 MR. DANNER: Alright. Good evening,
8 everyone.

9 Today is January 24th, 2023, and this is a
10 public hearing of the Washington Utilities and
11 Transportation Commission for the purpose of taking
12 public comment on the Clean Energy Implementation Plan
13 filed by Puget Sound Energy in UTC Docket UE-210795.

14 I'm Dave Danner. I'm chair of the Commission,
15 and I'm joined by my colleagues Commissioner Milt
16 Doumit and Commissioner Ann Rendahl.

17 By way of background, in 2019, the Washington
18 Legislature passed the Clean Energy Transformation Act,
19 or CETA, which, among other things, requires that the
20 State's electric utilities remove coal power from their
21 portfolios by the end of 2025, be net carbon neutral by
22 2030, and be 100 percent carbon free by 2025.

23 The Washington Utilities and Transportation
24 Commission regulates the State's investor-owned
25 utilities. To ensure that these utilities achieve the

1 target set out in CETA, the law requires each utility
2 to file a detailed plan, called a Clean Energy
3 Implementation Plan, every four years starting in 2021,
4 with updates every two years after a plan is filed.

5 These plans set out the utility's interim
6 targets and detail the actions of the utility to make
7 sure it will comply with CETA's 2030 and 2045 mandates.

8 Tonight we are hearing public comment on the
9 clean Emergency Implementation Plan filed by Puget
10 Sound Energy in December of 2021. In this plan, Puget
11 Sound Energy proposes an interim target of 63 percent
12 renewable energy by 2025 with specific sub-targets for
13 distributed energy resources and measures to ensure
14 that compliance costs are reasonable and that benefits
15 to customers are identified and equitably distributed.
16 The Commission will review this plan in a formal
17 adjudication.

18 The parties to the case are Puget Sound
19 Energy, the Commission's regulatory staff, which
20 functions independently from the Commissioners, because
21 the Commissioners act as judges, and advocates for
22 marginalized community - excuse me - as well as
23 industrial customers representatives for low-income
24 advocates, environmental advocates, and advocates for
25 marginalized communities of color.

1 By law, the Office of Public Counsel and the
2 Office of Attorney General represents the interests of
3 residential and small business customers of Puget Sound
4 Energy.

5 The comments we receive tonight, as well as
6 written comments we received from the public, will be
7 made part of the formal record in this proceeding. For
8 this reason, we will need to swear in all those who
9 comment tonight.

10 The Commissioners act as judges in this case.
11 And for that reason, we're here tonight to listen to
12 your comments, but not to engage in debate with
13 commenters, or to answer questions. If you have
14 questions about this case, we'll refer them either to
15 public counsel or to Andrew Roberts of Commission
16 staff, who will speak to you in a moment.

17 In fact, I will turn it over to Andrew Roberts
18 right now to cover some meeting logistics.

19 So go ahead, Andrew.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Good evening.

21 My name is Andrew Roberts. I'm a regulatory
22 analyst with the Commission's Consumer Protection
23 Center. I would like to cover some meeting logistics
24 tonight.

25 First, this hearing is being broadcast live on

1 TBW. We ask that everyone please mute your connections
2 unless you were called on to speak. If you're
3 participating via Zoom, you can mute your connection by
4 clicking the microphone icon on the bottom of the
5 screen. A slash will appear across a microphone
6 indicating you've muted your connection. If you called
7 in, you can press star 6 to mute your phone. And when
8 you're called on to speak, you can press star 6 again
9 to unmute yourself. After you're done speaking, we
10 remind everybody to please remember to mute themselves.

11 Please wait to be called on for comment and do
12 not interrupt other speakers.

13 There are two options this evening to report
14 technical difficulties. The first is the use of the
15 chat feature in Zoom. The second is to call Ryan Smith
16 at (360) 664-1165. Once again, that's (360) 664-1165.

17 The chat feature should only be used to report
18 technical difficulties. We will not be accepting
19 comments via the Zoom chat feature. Please do not use
20 the chat feature to provide your comments.

21 We ask everyone please limit their comment to
22 three minutes is a that everyone that has a chance to
23 speak.

24 If you have questions about the case, please
25 email comments@utc.wa.gov. Once again, that's comments

1 with an "s," @utc.wa.gov, or call 1(888)333-9882, and
2 ask to speak with me, Andrew Roberts.

3 Next, we have a list of folks who would like
4 to -- who have already signed up to speak tonight. If
5 you are -- if you've already signed up to speak, we
6 have, Jodi Blackburn-Roehl, Nora Rainwater, Gary Gooch,
7 Kathy Brenniman, Frank Damiano, Danny --

8 MR. DAMIANO: Here --

9 (Speaking simultaneously. Unreportable
10 crosstalk.)

11 MR. ROBERTS: -- Laura, and Karen Klein
12 [phonetic].

13 You do not need to provide your names to sign
14 in tonight. We already have your names.

15 We would like to ask anyone else who would
16 like to provide comment tonight to please raise your
17 hand. You can raise your hand by using the "reactions"
18 button in Zoom or pressing star 9 if you called in over
19 the phone.

20 I see Peter Werner is raising his hand on the
21 video. I will --

22 I got your name, Peter.

23 MR. WERNER: That's correct.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

25 I'm not seeing any other hands raised.

1 Okay. I see Jim Lazar, Pete Weymiller, Aubrey
2 Newton. Sorry. That was -- that was Aubrey Newton.
3 Jim Adcock, Ryan Grunkemeyer, and Gary with their hands
4 raised.

5 Okay. Is there anybody else?

6 And please try not to interrupt each other.

7 Is there anyone else who would like to provide
8 comment today?

9 Frank Damiano, we have your name. Thank you.

10 Okay. If anyone was not able to raise their
11 hand, could you please speak up now.

12 MR. FALLA: I'm unable to raise my hand for
13 reasons I cannot explain.

14 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

15 And your name is?

16 MR. FALLA: Adrian Falla. I have
17 communicated in chat.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

19 We have your name.

20 Okay. With that, I will turn the time over to
21 Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner
22 Doumit.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. DANNER: All right.

25 Thank you very much.

1 Unless my colleagues have any introductory
2 comments they would like to make, we will get right
3 into the public comment hearing.

4 And so I would ask if you are intending to
5 comment tonight, we need to swear you in. So please
6 raise your right hand.

7 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole
8 truth, and nothing but the truth? Please say "I do."

9 MR. LAZAR: Yes.

10 MS. NEWTON: I do.

11 MR. DAMIANO: Yes.

12 MS. KLEIN: I do.

13 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you. Thank
14 you very much.

15 We will start.

16 Jodi Blackburn-Roehl, you have signed up but
17 not clear whether you want to speak. Do you want to
18 make comments tonight?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. DANNER: All right. I'm not hearing
21 anything.

22 Nora Rainwater, would you like to make some
23 comments here?

24 MS. RAINWATER: Yes, I would like to make
25 a comment.

1 Can you hear me?

2 MR. DANNER: Yes, we can. Thank you.

3 MS. RAINWATER: Okay.

4 This is only about two minutes long.

5 When we disconnect from coal power and find
6 that wind power doesn't work well when the wind isn't
7 blowing, as Europe is realizing, and that the turbines
8 shred the birds flying into their paths, and that solar
9 needs a lot of sun to be most effective, a challenge
10 here in the Northwest, and it's actually mostly
11 auxiliary, not suited for sustained power, for the
12 thousands of households. We need to think about how
13 long it would take to get coal power back on line.
14 And, by the way, there are coal industry leaders that
15 have found very clean ways to burn coal.

16 Also, if we run out of electricity for our
17 homes, having rolling blackouts, I don't understand how
18 we'll be able to charge electric vehicles which have
19 batteries, by the way, that can and do ignite
20 spontaneously, taking hours or even days and thousands
21 of gallons of water to extinguish.

22 Furthermore, in the making of these
23 lithium-ion batteries, that requires tons of earth to
24 be dug up to obtain the materials to be used, in mostly
25 poor countries, and that rapes the earth in the poor

1 countries, which is not very sustainable or, by the
2 way, ethical.

3 And another thing to think about is that other
4 countries do not have the same eco-conscious ideas as
5 we do. So if we obtain materials from other countries,
6 China, wherever, they are not even worried about what
7 they do to the land.

8 So I am asking that you think of these things
9 in consideration of this if the whole point is to live
10 greener. We have to consider or other countries that
11 play into this because you know they don't have our
12 standards.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you very
15 much, Nora Rainwater. Appreciate your comments.

16 Let me turn to Gary Gooch. You signed up. Do
17 you wish to speak tonight?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. DANNER: Gary Gooch?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. DANNER: All right. We'll turn to
22 Kathy Brenniman.

23 Are you there?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. DANNER: All right. Frank Damiano,

1 are you there?

2 MR. DAMIANO: Yes, sir.

3 MR. DANNER: Go ahead, then.

4 MR. DAMIANO: The problem with these
5 proposals is Puget Sound Energy wants to pass the cost
6 of their ideas onto us. I don't want that. They just
7 increased the cost of natural gas this November 2022,
8 and they increased the cost of electric and natural gas
9 again this January 2023.

10 Regarding the proposal involving removing coal
11 as a source of electricity, I would like to suggest --
12 why not move toward clean coal technologies, which are
13 already working in other facilities?

14 Regarding the proposal involving wind and the
15 wind turbines, I have concerns:

16 A) Ice accumulation on the blades contributed
17 to power outages during the 2021 Texas blackout.

18 B) Wind turbines are prone to gearbox failure
19 in only ten years. And the gearbox is costly to
20 replace.

21 It goes without saying when the turbine is not
22 spinning, it's not generating revenue or power.

23 Finally, the fiberglass blades on the wind
24 turbines last only 20 years. And they're not
25 cost-effective to recycle. Therefore, the blades are

1 often sent to landfills.

2 Conclusion: We need to make sure we are not
3 solving one problem and creating another.

4 That's it.

5 MR. DANNER: All right.

6 Thank you very much. I appreciate your
7 comments.

8 Danita Geyer, are you there, and do you wish
9 to speak this evening?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. DANNER: All right.

12 We have someone signed up as Laura, with no
13 last name.

14 Are you on the line? Do you wish to speak
15 tonight?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. DANNER: All right.

18 Karen Klein, are you there? Are you --

19 MS. KLEIN: Hi. Yes.

20 Can you hear me okay?

21 MR. DANNER: Yes. Thank you.

22 MS. KLEIN: Yeah. I would like to speak
23 in favor of decarbonizing. I think that's a great
24 idea. I have nothing against wind power or any of the
25 other things that have been mentioned so far tonight.

1 What I do have a problem with is the
2 regressive tax structure that we have in our state that
3 then this Commission is going to offload your costs
4 onto your general customer, who is suffering through,
5 you know, not only a pandemic, but an inflationary
6 period and the like. And the average person cannot
7 take, what I'm reading, is a 15.8 percent increase in
8 their bill, you know, soon. And I think that's
9 unreasonable.

10 And I think that we need to look to taxing
11 billionaires in this state. And we need to look to our
12 legislature to fund the decarbonization of fossil fuels
13 by taxing the right people. And this is not fair for
14 the average person in Washington state. And it's going
15 to be hard on families. And I -- I'm just (inaudible
16 Zoom audio) against it. We know that there's plenty of
17 wealthy people that are for decarbonizing. Let them
18 pay for it.

19 That's the end.

20 MR. DANNER: All right.

21 Thank you very much for your comment.

22 Peter Werner, and then Jim Lazar.

23 Peter Werner, are you there?

24 MR. WERNER: Yes. I just -- I just --

25 MR. DANNER: All right.

1 MR. WERNER -- un-muted.

2 MR. DANNER: Please go ahead.

3 MR. WERNER: I come from -- I come from a
4 back- -- I'm an electrical engineer, a retired
5 electrical engineer; 40 years of controlling and
6 converting power and energy, which are both very
7 different for both -- primarily for industrial
8 processes, but dealing with systems in the megawatt and
9 above. So -- and I'm very very familiar and
10 knowledgeable about the physics of converting energy
11 and controlling it.

12 There's a lot of rabbit holes we can go down
13 here. The primary one for me, at this stage, is the
14 unrealistic expectation that wind -- voltaic solar and
15 wind turbines are potential sources of energy. They're
16 actually sources of intermittent and relatively diluted
17 or regularly diluted, I should say, sources of power.

18 They do come from wind and solar energy, but
19 in their transduction to turning turbines, they now are
20 power systems. And both UTC and PSE and a lot of
21 people conflate the issues relative to energy and
22 power.

23 So they are not sources of energy. Energy is
24 something you can store. It generally has mass and can
25 be transported. There's no way of storing wind or

1 solar, other than directly into batteries. But
2 batteries themselves are no more a source of energy,
3 unless charged, than empty tanks are a source of fuel.

4 So it's a dangerous path, I believe, in going
5 down and expecting that you're going to take wind and
6 solar and voltaic solar. You know, there's thermal
7 solar. That's another source of steam. But that's my
8 main concern.

9 If we were truly interested in reducing the
10 problems with burning fossil fuels, and there are,
11 okay? I think they're fairly overblown --
12 substantially overblown. But if there is a concern in
13 reducing the pollution due to the burning of fossil
14 fuels, there should be a stellar interest in the
15 fission of uranium or what other -- so right now
16 uranium is the most logical source. And that seems to
17 be totally off the board, from what I can read.
18 Every -- all of the -- all of the efforts seem to be
19 towards wind and solar.

20 And there's so many problems with turbines. A
21 couple people have mentioned them, but wind turbines,
22 the larger they get, the higher they are, the more
23 massive they are on towers that are actually around the
24 world beginning to fall down because they're extremely
25 complicated systems to engineer effectively.

1 In the mid ranges, in the high kilowatt
2 levels, they're reasonably safe and doable, even though
3 there are units that are up into the megawatts.

4 Anyway, I could go down a ton of rabbit holes
5 here. I think all the folks involved in this have to
6 look at it from a good practical engineering position
7 and understand the difference between power and energy.
8 There's a huge, huge difference between power and
9 energy.

10 And with wind and voltaic solar, you're
11 dealing with power. It's intermittent, and it diluted.
12 And it's not energy. Unless you can store it and move
13 it, it's not energy.

14 So I'll stop at that.

15 I'm sure you're well-intentioned. I'm very
16 certain you're all well-intentioned. But many of
17 you -- many of you are technically misguided.

18 MR. DANNER: All right.

19 Thank you for your comments.

20 Jim Lazar followed by Pete Weymiller.

21 Jim Lazar, go ahead.

22 MR. LAZAR: Thank you. And Good evening.

23 I recommend that the Commission order in this
24 docket direct PSE to include two additional measures in
25 its next update of the CEIP.

1 The first of these is to include examination
2 of a service rule change, that water heaters and EV
3 chargers over 3 and a half kw be served by smart
4 circuit breakers or other control networks. This would
5 make a great deal of additional demand response
6 available on the order of a thousand at peak for water
7 heaters alone.

8 The shape of these two loads is very peak
9 coincident. Every new electric water heater already
10 has a socket for control radio. Most 6 kw and above EV
11 chargers also have controls enabled.

12 You can identify these with the interval data
13 that smart meters provide. Water heaters typically
14 hold a day's supply, so being curtailed for an hour
15 here and there is just not a problem. Modern heat pump
16 water heaters can be set to heat pump only mode and
17 will not exceed the 3.5 kw limit. Every one of us
18 would rather have our hot water and EV chargers
19 interrupted if the alternative is a rolling blackout or
20 purchase of extremely expensive power.

21 The second issue is that PSE should study the
22 transfer of its customers in Skagit, Whatcom, Kitsap,
23 and Kittitas Counties to electric service by the local
24 public utility districts. This would reduce PSE loads,
25 and thus accelerate the rate at which they could move

1 to a hundred percent clean energy.

2 These PUDs can access VPA power in the 2027
3 new contract process and serve these customers with
4 clean energy. They will likely be able to provide
5 service at rates comparable to or lower than PSE. So
6 these customers will be worse off because of BPA's
7 lower wholesale power prices.

8 Because these are counties in which PSE
9 provides only electricity, not natural gas, PSE does
10 not achieve economies of scope as it does, for example,
11 in Thurston County, where it provides both electricity
12 and natural gas.

13 As a result, those of us who take both
14 services from PSE in essence subsidize those who take
15 only electricity and pay more than our share of the
16 admin costs. I believe shutting these customers will
17 help lower costs for PSE's remaining customers. So
18 please direct PSE to study these two items in the order
19 in this docket.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you very
22 much.

23 And Pete Werner, I think, followed by Aubrey
24 Newton.

25 Pete Werner, go ahead.

1 MR. WEYMILLER: Pete Weymiller?

2 MR. DANNER: I'm sorry. Could you spell
3 that, sir?

4 MR. WEYMILLER: Can you hear me?

5 MR. DANNER: Yes.

6 MR. WEYMILLER: W-E-Y (inaudible Zoom
7 audio). And I'm sure you know how to spell the first
8 name.

9 MR. DANNER: Yes.

10 MR. WEYMILLER: Okay. Very good.

11 Hello, Commissioners. And thank you for
12 holding this hearing and for showing interest in the
13 welfare of PSE Customers.

14 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
15 is a globally-accepted authority on climate change,
16 probably because their report is the consensus of 97
17 percent of publishing climatologists. Recently the
18 IPCC reported that climate change is now widespread,
19 rapid, and intensifying. We've witnessed this in
20 recent years.

21 Two weeks ago, NOAA released a report showing
22 that damage from climate changes this last year in the
23 US total \$165.1 billion. We're already seeing how
24 increasing temperatures evaporate more moisture in our
25 atmospheric rivers locally, and we're still seeing

1 droughts, forest fires, higher incidences of lightning
2 strikes, higher risk -- the list goes on. A large
3 share of greenhouse gases come from our energy sector.
4 Not only do fossil fuels poison our land, water, and
5 air, they're overheating our planet quicker than even
6 the IPCC predicted.

7 I appreciate the PSE committing to their
8 target goal of RE of 15 percent, and then exceeding
9 that for the last two years. And I appreciate them,
10 too, for their commitment to implement significant wind
11 power. After ten years, we're counting on them to live
12 up to their word and make this rubber meet the road.

13 But we need them to take advantage of all of
14 the opportunities right now to meet this climate
15 challenge, and to do it right - - do right by PSE
16 customers that are under PSE care only.

17 Some of us are doing our part. I have 58
18 solar panels on a home in Gig Harbor. I'm in contract
19 to have panels and battery backups installed on two
20 more homes that I recently purchased in a low-income
21 neighborhood in Bremerton.

22 This is a community of honest and hard working
23 people who help each other out. Most of our homes are
24 80 to 100 years old, with inadequate insulation and
25 outdated appliances. A neighbor and I have heat pumps,

1 but our electricity was still over \$250 a month. And
2 this is before the 8.7 percent increase.

3 How are any of my neighbors supposed to get
4 ahead to buy energy and cost-saving insulation and RE
5 technology? Some neighbors offset heat costs by
6 burning wood, creating more dangerous particulates.

7 We've already experienced historic,
8 self-inflicted damage to our environments, and we know
9 that (inaudible Zoom audio) greatest opportunity in
10 history to reduce our greenhouse gases.

11 Recently passed were a bipartisan
12 infrastructure bill and the Inflation Reduction Act
13 with funds to address this very emergency. And the
14 cost of RE technology has already dropped significantly
15 with increased innovation scale. Solar panels are now
16 50 percent lower than when we installed ours. But the
17 time is now. The technology is here. The funding is
18 here. We just need to do the right thing and be
19 responsible to customers that rely on us.

20 Sure, it may be easier and cheaper in the
21 short run to (inaudible Zoom audio) delays and
22 (inaudible Zoom audio) the RFP (inaudible Zoom audio)
23 as a result to adopt a minimum 2 percent RE to become
24 compliant, (inaudible Zoom audio) all of us from
25 reading our target goal. (Inaudible Zoom audio) make

1 things worse. Please don't wait for RFP and jump on
2 all the opportunities to modernize our electricity
3 generation and use. We can always change the plan
4 later. Let's cover all bets.

5 Right now will be known as the defining moment
6 for PSE. Will they step up to the challenge of social
7 responsibility for their loyal but captive customers?
8 Please, let's together put PSE and their customers at
9 the leading edge of innovation at a time that it is
10 needed most and avoid the delay that will be costly for
11 so many stakeholders on so many levels.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you.

14 And then we will go to Aubrey Newton, followed
15 by Pete Werner.

16 All right. Aubrey Newton, are you there?

17 MS. NEWTON: I am.

18 Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for
19 the opportunity to speak this evening.

20 As mentioned, my name's Aubrey Newton, and I'm
21 speaking this evening on behalf of the Washington and
22 Northern Idaho District Council of Laborers. We
23 represent thousands of construction workers who build
24 our states and energy infrastructure. We are also an
25 affiliate of the Laborers' International Union of North

1 America, or LIUNA, which represents over 500,000
2 workers in the United States and Canada. Again, we
3 thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on
4 PSE's CIP this evening.

5 When compared to other investor-owned
6 utilities, Puget has taken steps to promote
7 high-quality labor standards. The company's 2021
8 All-Source RFP, for example, gives preference to
9 projects that utilize project labor agreements as well
10 as projects constructed with high labor standards,
11 including family-sustaining wages and benefits and
12 employment opportunities for local workers. PSE is
13 also requiring union labor provisions in its future
14 Green Direct program projects. We commend the company
15 for these efforts.

16 In order to capture the full value, though, of
17 clean energy employment benefits, we offer suggestions
18 to the company's job-related customer benefit
19 indicators, or their CBIs. PSE's six employment
20 metrics are intended to assess the quality and quantity
21 of jobs created to the extent to which local workers
22 and highly-impacted and vulnerable communities have
23 access to these jobs.

24 We believe, however, that absent specific
25 employment targets and baseline data, the proposed

1 metrics will provide an incomplete picture of net
2 benefits. The company and the Commission can use data
3 related to the Lund Hill Solar Farm developed by
4 Avangrid for PSEs Green Direct program as a baseline to
5 measure the indicators. Alternatively, the company can
6 compare proposed clean energy job metrics to the
7 quality of fossil fuel construction jobs.

8 Because our members have been employed on both
9 clean energy and fossil fuel construction jobs, and our
10 local affiliates regularly visit construction job
11 sites, we know that the clean energy sector has lower
12 local employment rates and offers lower wages and
13 benefits compared to fossil fuel related energy,
14 projects. Therefore, the Commission and the utilities
15 can also reference public infrastructure projects in
16 Washington State for targeted hiring rates of local
17 workers, registered apprentices, and workers from
18 historically disadvantaged communities.

19 Furthermore, PSE and the Commission can
20 utilize union collective bargaining rates and
21 prevailing wages and benefits as a baseline to assess
22 the quality of clean energy construction jobs.

23 If the Commission does not adopt these
24 recommendations, the Commission should order PSE at
25 least to work with labor stakeholders to establish

1 employment targets for local workers and workers from
2 highly-impacted and vulnerable communities and to
3 determine the appropriate data sources to measure the
4 quality of clean energy jobs.

5 Again, we'll be submitting these comments
6 further to the Commission via email for further review,
7 and we thank you very much for your time this evening.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you very
10 much. I appreciate your comments.

11 Peter Werner, do you wish to speak?

12 MR. WERNER: Yes. I already did, but I
13 would be --

14 MR. DANNER: Oh.

15 MR. WERNER: I would love to keep talking.
16 But...

17 MR. DANNER: I'm sorry. I'm getting you
18 mixed up with Pete Weymiller. So pardon me for doing
19 that.

20 MR. WERNER: And I think he -- anyway,
21 I'll let you go.

22 MR. DANNER: All right.

23 If you have additional comments, we would
24 accept written comments, as Andrew Roberts laid out
25 earlier.

1 MR. WERNER: Understood.

2 MR. DANNER: So now we will go, then, to
3 Jim Adcock, followed by Brian Grunkemeyer.

4 MR. ADCOCK: Thank you.

5 MR. DANNER: Jim Adcock, are you there?

6 MR. ADCOCK: Yeah. Thank you.

7 Can you hear me?

8 MR. DANNER: Yes, I can.

9 MR. ADCOCK: James Adcock, electrical
10 engineer, MIT stakeholder, and leading Puget Sound
11 critic for the last dozen-plus years.

12 What Puget should be doing? Maximizing energy
13 efficiency, maximizing demand response, such as demand
14 response in electric water heaters. These are lowest
15 costs. They are always lowest costs. Lowest costs
16 first.

17 Next, wind power. Lowest cost wind power.
18 Wind power is about \$35 a megawatt hour; less than just
19 the fuel costs of running natural gas generation.

20 Every wind tower Puget build saves ratepayers
21 money. It does not cost us money. It saves us money.
22 But Puget tells us IPR stakeholders that is not what
23 they are going to do. They are not going to build what
24 Puget calls renewables overbuild. It is not overbuild
25 unless more than 100 percent of Puget's power comes

1 from renewables.

2 Instead, Puget wants to build more natural gas
3 generation but simply call that generation hydrogen
4 generation. And by calling it hydrogen generation,
5 Puget claims it qualifies for CEIP. This is what Puget
6 is telling IRP stakeholders. So that is what Puget is
7 really doing. Continued business as usual, building
8 yet even more natural gas generation, but not even to
9 serve their own ratepayers, but rather to serve
10 California ratepayers. Most of this new natural gas
11 power will be going to California. We pay to build it,
12 but the power goes to California.

13 CBIs. Puget invents CBIs out of thin air to
14 justify what Puget wants to build, which is not lowest
15 cost, not nearly lowest costs, but rather the most
16 expensive and the least amount of greenhouse gas
17 reductions so that Puget can get to a Puget-invented 2
18 percent off-ramp without doing the real required
19 greenhouse gas reductions.

20 Puget will get to 2030 having spent nearly an
21 additional 20 percent on taxpayer rates in addition to
22 natural gas fuel cost inflations. And then besides
23 [indecipherable], not show any real substantial
24 greenhouse gas reductions, not getting to the 80
25 percent, as required by CETA.

1 Off-ramps. The 2 percent off-ramp does not
2 exist until after 2030, but Puget is required by CETA
3 to get 80 percent -- to get to 80 percent by 2030. So
4 there is no 2 percent off-ramp excuse for Puget not to
5 get to 80 percent. But Puget is claiming they can make
6 that excuse. No, they can not. Puget can not avoid
7 the 80 percent by 2030 requirement simply by wasting
8 ratepayer monies in sufficient amounts to get out of
9 that requirement. Puget must get to 80 percent by 2030
10 period.

11 There is, on the other hand, a different
12 off-ramp. There is the cost containment alternative
13 compliance payments that the legislature built into
14 CETA to keep ratepayers from getting ripped off.
15 Rather than pay an excess amount of ratepayer money for
16 any method, Puget can just use alternative compliance.
17 So Puget should never be paying more per megawatt hour
18 for any method than the price of natural gas generation
19 plus the alternative compliance payment, which gives
20 you total something like \$120 per megawatt hour.

21 So if Puget wants to spend more than about
22 \$120 per megawatt hour on some method, UTC must simply
23 say clearly, no, that is too expensive. Nothing should
24 cost ratepayers more than about \$120 per megawatt hour,
25 period. That is why the legislature put the cost

1 containment cap in there. \$120 max. Not \$550 per
2 megawatt [indecipherable].

3 In summary, I believe this is all turning into
4 an unmitigated disaster with Puget wasting money
5 willy-nilly, at the same time failing to meet
6 significant greenhouse gas reductions. This is to be
7 expected. Monopoly power behavior. This is why UTC
8 exists, to stop utility monopolies from engaging in
9 this kind of egregious behavior, so-called
10 environmental hostage taking. Please stop Puget from
11 doing this egregious behavior. Do not let them get
12 away with this.

13 Thank you for your consideration.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you very
16 much, James Adcock.

17 Brian Grunkemeyer, are you there?

18 MR. GRUNKEMEYER: Yes. Yes.

19 MR. DANNER: Yes.

20 You would like to make comments?

21 MR. GRUNKEMEYER: Absolutely.

22 I'm Brian Grunkemeyer from Redmond. I'm also
23 a PSE customer. But I'm also the founder of
24 FlexCharging, an electric vehicle demand flexibility
25 provider.

1 We shift charging for electric vehicles to the
2 best time of day to keep EV charging green and cheap.
3 And we can help charge cars before weather events cause
4 power outages to improve resiliency. I want to raise
5 the bar for our vision and ambition by talking about
6 our solution.

7 We've done work with utilities in Australia
8 and the US to avoid EV charging during peak times. In
9 Australia, we were able to shift about three-fourths of
10 the charging to off-peak times, and we helped to soak
11 up excess solar. In Australia, they frequently have
12 negative power prices, so this shifting was a great way
13 to lower total system costs. We can do the same thing
14 by importing solar from California.

15 In Maine, we were able to shift 85 percent of
16 the power away from their peak period. And with a
17 project with Rocky Mountain Power, we modeled that we
18 can save 45 percent of the carbon emissions used to
19 charge your car.

20 This technology is ready for my company and
21 several others. We could have helped reduce carbon
22 emissions last year. It's time to embrace demand
23 flexibility to reduce carbon emissions now.

24 So getting to the CEIP, I think PSE should be
25 looking at a higher amount of demand response. We

1 would like to replace demand response with demand
2 flexibility where utilities incentivize doing the right
3 thing everyday instead of begging people to shut off
4 power on a few peak days. However, DR is a good step
5 in the first direction. Or a small -- a small first
6 step.

7 And to echo Jim Lazar's point, smart hot water
8 heaters are a perfect idea for our region, especially
9 since our state already requires smart hot water
10 heaters to be installed everywhere.

11 Execution-wise, I would like to make sure that
12 PSE actually builds something quickly as a result of
13 this CEIP. They have, in the past, issued RFPs, but
14 not necessarily acquired any resources as a result of
15 that RFP. That process makes you wonder whether it's
16 just a legal requirement as opposed to a more
17 deliberate way to expand their portfolio.

18 And lastly, the Sierra Club and Northwest
19 Energy Coalition both provided very good comments.
20 Please review them if you haven't.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you very
23 much. Appreciate your comments.

24 All right. We have an individual who
25 identified themselves as Gary.

1 Gary, are you on the line?

2 MR. LINDAHL: I am.

3 Can you hear me okay?

4 MR. DANNER: Yes.

5 You didn't provide a last name. Do you wish
6 to do so or --

7 MR. LINDAHL: Yes, I do. Last name is
8 Lindahl, L-I-N-D-A-H-L.

9 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you.

10 MR. LINDAHL: And I'm also a professional
11 engineer.

12 MR. DANNER: Okay.

13 Go ahead, then.

14 MR. LINDAHL: The CEIP appears to be
15 overly reliant on intermittent, unreliable solar and
16 wind. I think this will lead to a less reliable grid.
17 And the CEIP mentions a maximum power output expected
18 from wind and solar. I find that very misleading
19 because the maximum power for these systems is rarely
20 achieved for more than an hour or two a day.

21 It also mentions a battery peak power, but not
22 the energy capacity of the battery, which would be like
23 kilowatt hours. I also find that very misleading.
24 They throw out these big numbers, but it's kind of
25 meaningless.

1 They also mentioned a biomass, which I find
2 amusing. If we're going to burn stuff for energy, why
3 not build waste energy facilities like Europe does? So
4 burying garbage is just a cheap methane generator.

5 The plan for more base load power is surly
6 lacking. I didn't see anything on small modular
7 reactors. I think Bill Gates could help you with that,
8 by the way.

9 I know we do have a lot of water power in this
10 state. But, as you know, the earth is heating up.
11 What if we run out of water like Lake Mead is
12 experiencing right now? I think this whole plan is a
13 plan for disaster, and we need to focus a lot more on
14 base load power.

15 Thank you for your time.

16 MR. DANNER: All right.

17 Thank you very much. Appreciate your
18 comments.

19 Adrian Falla, are you there?

20 MR. FALLA: I am. Thank you.

21 MR. DANNER: All right.

22 Please go ahead.

23 MR. FALLA: Hello.

24 I'm a one-year resident of Soundview Estates,
25 which is a roughly two-year-old development located

1 inside Census Tract 0900.

2 I have begun gathering information in recent
3 weeks to brief our homeowners association board, since
4 all of our members were surprised by the
5 October 22nd -- excuse me, October 2022 announcement of
6 a planned biodiesel peaker plant .2 miles directly to
7 our west.

8 Whidbey Seabrook developer Tenaska is angling
9 for a contract with PSE. We are playing catch-up, so
10 we are unclear where their proposal may fit in this
11 draft CIP. So I apologize for not being well-oriented
12 to the specifics of the discussion on the document in
13 hand. But we will catch up.

14 The [indecipherable] family, the site owners,
15 pitched the site to the developers as remote and
16 secluded. Their application studiously underplays our
17 proximity as a low-density residential zone in the
18 northeast, approximately .2 miles.

19 Soundview Estates is a development which has
20 241 homes built. 230-plus families have purchased
21 homes there, including my own. We have 269 active
22 registered voters. Our personal capital investment in
23 our homes to date is in excess of \$152 million. And
24 there are 99 more homes currently under construction at
25 Soundview West, which is even closer to the proposed

1 plant.

2 I have some metrics on why our Census Tract
3 080900 does not deserve to be saddled with the
4 emissions of a 219 megawatt biodiesel peaker plant
5 pumping its emissions 60 feet over our heads.

6 Our immediate neighbors comprise a population
7 living in poverty at level 8 out of 10. Babies in our
8 vicinity are at risk for low birth weight at level 9
9 out of 10. In a single-parent household, that level is
10 9 out of 10. Overcrowded housing is level 9 out of 10.
11 We're 9 out of 10 for premature deaths. Our social
12 vulnerability to hazards overall is 8 out of 10. We're
13 already at level 10 out of 10 for toxic releases from
14 facilities on the RSEI model. And we also enjoy
15 proximity to not one, not two, but 3 EPA Superfund
16 sites.

17 We may well meet Department of Health
18 standards for environmental health disparities and a
19 designation as a highly impacted community. We'll be
20 exploring that pretty energetically in the coming
21 weeks.

22 Our census tract score is level 7 out of 10
23 for sensitive populations. And our downwind tract also
24 includes tribal lands.

25 Our district has historically been electorally

1 passive, with low voting rates at level 9 out of 10. I
2 promise you, we're going to fix that.

3 Biodiesel emissions include some components
4 which pose known adverse health impacts and others, but
5 very little is known as yet. We are expecting to
6 develop our concerns with greater knowledge of the
7 airshed patterns that are modeled.

8 We are playing catch-up with a vengeance. And
9 we've already gained significant initial insights from
10 initial public records requests we filed with various
11 agencies, including PSCAA for the Seabrook application
12 itself, which is quite interesting.

13 We've obtained voter registration records, FEC
14 contribution histories for elected officials in the
15 area and so forth. We're very aware of the razor-thin
16 margins by which local races are decided.

17 I just wanted to let you know that we will be
18 paying close attention and getting engaged with the
19 Commission in every way that we can.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. DANNER: All right. Thank you.
22 Appreciate your comments.

23 That's -- let me go back to some folks that I
24 called on earlier who did not respond.

25 Jodi Blackburn-Roehl, are you on the line, and

1 do you wish to comment this evening?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. DANNER: All right.

4 Gary Gooch, are you on the line, and do you
5 wish to comment this evening?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. DANNER: Kathy Brenniman, are you on
8 the line?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. DANNER: Danita Geyer?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. DANNER: And Laura, who did not
13 provide a last name?

14 (No response.)

15 MS. BRENNIMAN: Hello?

16 MR. DANNER: Yes. Who is this?

17 MS. BRENNIMAN: Yes, this is Kathy
18 Brenniman. Sorry. My -- it was muted earlier --

19 MR. DANNER: Oh, okay.

20 MS. BRENNIMAN: -- so I did respond.

21 MR. DANNER: Okay.

22 We can --

23 MS. BRENNIMAN: Thank you.

24 MR. DANNER: We can hear you. I hope you
25 can hear us.

1 MS. BRENNIMAN: Yes. Great. Thank you.

2 Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

3 So my concerns are about the environment and
4 climate change.

5 The wind energy has been hailed as the least
6 polluting and least harmful to the environment among
7 the renewable energy resources. We have been told that
8 their greenhouse gas emissions are low, and so it's
9 assumed that we impact global warming climate change
10 the least. And when energy is renewable. So these are
11 significant advantages. However, there are a number of
12 negatives. And the number one is our threat to
13 wildlife.

14 Wind turbines are known to disrupt wildlife in
15 multiple ways. Wherever commercial wind farms are
16 located, the birds have a hard time surviving. Whether
17 they're small or big, Birds stand a slim chance of
18 surviving a direct hit with the turbine blades. And
19 with many turbines located in an area, it's no wonder
20 that the population of birds goes down.

21 I'm a resident of Whidbey Island, and I see
22 bald eagles and other migratory birds in the area. And
23 the continued extinction of bird species would be a
24 tragedy for all of us. In the US alone, the annual
25 bird toll estimated to be 500,000 and 700,000. This

1 doesn't take into account the insect fatalities.

2 It's estimated that a single wind turbine can
3 kill up to 40 million insects nationally -- annually,
4 I'm sorry. So the impact of the insect and bird
5 population of a region is bound to have a negative
6 effect on the environment as well.

7 Besides the slaughter of the flying species in
8 the animal kingdom, large-scale wind farms disrupt the
9 habitat of all wildlife. When large tracts of land are
10 cleared for setting up a wind farm, the transformation
11 of the landscape can adversely affect all wildlife in
12 the region. Destruction of habitat, fragmentation
13 habitat, disruption of migratory paths, and loss of
14 feeding and breeding grounds can lead to a decline in
15 the reproductive abilities and reduction of population.
16 All these have a negative effect on the biodiversity of
17 the region, which may have a domino effect on the
18 environment.

19 And it affects local weather. The blades of
20 the turbine turn to generate electricity. It also has
21 inadvertent consequences. It creates disturbance in
22 the air that can have far-reaching effects on the
23 environment. The turbulence created by wind turbines
24 is known to warm up the surface temperature at night
25 and pull it cool it during the day. The warming can

1 raise the temperature by up to 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit,
2 and cool it down by up to .7 decrease Fahrenheit. This
3 is from a 2018 study by Harvard University scientists.
4 This research supports more than ten other studies that
5 have observed warming near operational US wind farms.

6 There's also noise pollution. Though
7 commercial wind farms are typically located far away
8 from human habitation, there are instances where people
9 living in the vicinity of wind turbines are affected by
10 the sounds wind turbines produce when their blades
11 turn, making a whooshing sound. The generators kept
12 within the wind turbine also generates a humming sound.
13 Sound generated by large turbines can be heard up to a
14 mile away. And this is known to impact sleep patterns,
15 and at times the mental health of people.

16 And I personally have experienced this in
17 Texas. My sister has a ranch with turbines on
18 adjoining ranches, and the noise is unrelenting. The
19 value of their properties also decline drastically.

20 The disturbing effects of noise pollution on
21 animals and birds still remains unknown. And the
22 safety issues at sea, setting up wind (inaudible Zoom
23 audio). Wind turbines at sea may be a solution to
24 reduce its negative impact on humans and wildlife on
25 the land; however, it can disrupt the lives and

1 habitats of sea creatures.

2 The (inaudible Zoom audio) location is another
3 problem. Typically wind farms are located far away
4 from cities and towns. Intentionally, remote locations
5 are chosen for setting up wind farms so that
6 large-scale land acquisition is possible. However,
7 this means paving new roads and transporting machinery
8 and construction material to the site.

9 The same is the case with offshore wind farms.
10 They can increase boat traffic, leading to more
11 greenhouse gas emissions and pollution. In the
12 (inaudible Zoom audio) phase, also they increase
13 traffic in the region and adversely impact the
14 environment.

15 The carbon footprints of turbines. The
16 manufacturer of wind turbines needs metals and other
17 materials. Collection of these raw materials as well
18 as the manufacturing process are often run using fossil
19 fuels. After manufacture, the turbines need to be
20 transported to the location of the wind farms.

21 Further, the construction of the wind farms
22 and the setting up of the turbines are an additional
23 assault on the environment. It requires 60 gallons of
24 oil to lubricate the tur-...

25 (Pause.)

1 MR. DANNER: Did we just disconnect?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. DANNER: No? Okay.

4 Carol [sic] Brenniman, I'm afraid we lost your
5 connection.

6 All right. At this point that is everyone who
7 has signed in to speak.

8 Let me ask if there is anyone on the call who
9 has not spoken and did not sign in who wishes to speak
10 this evening. You can either use the raise your hand
11 function or simply speak up.

12 (No response.)

13 MR. DANNER: All right.

14 Hearing nothing, that concludes the public
15 comment this evening.

16 We have -- again, I want to make clear that we
17 will be receiving written comments.

18 Let me ask my colleagues, do we have a cutoff
19 date for written comments at this point?

20 MS. RENDAHL: Commissioner Danner, it's
21 usually a week after the hearing is concluded. I
22 believe the hearing concludes next Wednesday, the 1st.

23 MR. DANNER: Okay.

24 MS. RENDAHL: So I believe the deadline
25 would be the 8th in our --

1 MR. DANNER: Okay.

2 MS. RENDAHL -- usual practice.

3 MR. DANNER: All right.

4 That is my understanding as well.

5 So we will be receiving written public
6 comments through February 8th. And as you can see on
7 the slide, here are the ways to provide comments.

8 MS. RENDAHL: Commissioner Danner, there
9 was a hand up from someone with the initials "DEK."
10 And I don't know if that person wished to speak or not.
11 I just wanted to let you know.

12 MR. DANNER: Okay. I do not -- I do not
13 see that.

14 Andrew Roberts, do you?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. DANNER: All right. Let me ask again.

17 Is there anyone on the line who wishes to
18 speak to us this evening?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. DANNER: Okay.

21 MS. BRENNIMAN: I think I was cut off. But
22 maybe it ran too long?

23 MR. DANNER: Well, I do see a "DEK" with a
24 hand up.

25 MS. KELLOGG: Hi, there.

1 This is Devon Kellogg, DEK.

2 MR. DANNER: All right.

3 And how do you spell your name?

4 MS. KELLOGG: It's D-E-V-O-N, Kellogg
5 K-E-L-L-O-G-G.

6 MR. DANNER: Okay.

7 And do you wish to comment this evening?

8 MS. KELLOGG: Yes.

9 MR. DANNER: Okay.

10 MS. KELLOGG: Although I am a novice. So
11 I'm trying to just incorporate all of the reading
12 through the summary of the CEIP and listening to the
13 testimony.

14 I just wanted to just share my concerns about
15 meeting the climate goals of the CETA.

16 And just to address some of the concerns
17 people are having about, one, the birds, about the wind
18 turbines. I know that Autobahn, who is very concerned
19 about bird welfare, they actually support clean energy
20 and wind as part of that. It's just a siting issue,
21 where they're located.

22 And I know that if you're comparing that to,
23 like, buildings, it's a very small fraction. So
24 there's -- I don't want to say it's not a concern. I
25 just think that the bigger concern of the climate is

1 much more applicable to the bird survival.

2 And the other comment I had is about the
3 reliability. And I'm wondering, as a homeowner and a
4 person who is interested in purchasing electric
5 vehicles and those kinds of newer technologies,
6 electrification. And I know that a lot of that is now
7 required in our state, is going to be over time, that
8 those offer opportunities for battery storage on site.
9 And that, to me, is -- I don't know if that's
10 considered in the CEIP or -- but I would really like
11 that to be part of it, for both, you know, the
12 making (inaudible Zoom audio).

13 Instead of spending a lot of time and resource
14 or energy and costs and resources making big battery
15 sites, to have distributed batteries that are going to
16 be pretty much in every home soon. And those
17 batteries, as I understand, for example, the Ford
18 F-150, can power a home for up to a week or more.

19 So these are things that I hope are being
20 considered, as well as distributed generation, as well
21 as with solar and those kinds of things.

22 So anyway, thank you for letting me talk as,
23 you know, a teacher and a parent that's not really
24 knowledgeable about this but has a lot of concern and
25 investment in having this succeed. I appreciate you

1 listening to my thoughts.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. DANNER: Thank you.

4 And we very much appreciate your coming out
5 tonight and offering them to us.

6 So thank you very much.

7 I see another hand up. Anne K?

8 ANNE K: Yes. I didn't sign up to
9 comment. So I know you're at the end of your time. So
10 I humbly request a few moments for actually my husband,
11 Richard Leeds, here to make a comment.

12 MR. DANNER: All right.

13 ANNE K: All right. Thank you.

14 MR. DANNER: He is welcome to go ahead.

15 ANNE K: Thank you.

16 MR. LEEDS: I was hoping that you might
17 have information for the comparative environmental
18 impact, both in the -- in the full -- full gamut of
19 impacts comparing wind with -- with fossil fuels of
20 different types, natural gas, oil and coal.

21 I've certainly seen huge amounts of
22 devastation at the mining level, the railroad
23 transportation level, the refinement, the burning, and
24 certainly the number of wind turbines to equal -- a
25 fossil fuel plant is not one-to-one, so I would think

1 that there might be something in the per kilowatt hour
2 or megawatt hour or hundred megawatt hour production so
3 that we could get a better understanding of the
4 comparison of the environmental damage done in the --
5 in the production and the full lifecycle.

6 And, of course, we do see how much fly ash is
7 used in various different places. And the dilution of
8 fly ash into the ground where it's distributed after
9 it's been used is part of that lifecycle.

10 So thank you very much for entertaining these
11 questions.

12 MR. DANNER: Thank you.

13 And could I ask, could you spell your name for
14 us for the record.

15 MR. LEEDS: Richard L-E-E-D-S. Leeds.

16 MR. DANNER: All right.

17 Thank you, Richard Leeds. I appreciate it.

18 MR. LEEDS: Oh, and we're -- we're big
19 supporters. So thank you very much for being here.

20 MR. DANNER: And thank you for
21 participating this evening.

22 All right. Is there anyone else on the call
23 who has not commented who wishes to comment this
24 evening?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. DANNER: All right.

2 In that case, we have come to the end of our
3 public hearing tonight.

4 As I said, we will continue to receive public
5 comments in writing. As you can see on the screen, you
6 can email comments to comments@utc.wa.gov. We also
7 have a public comment forum. And a PO Box, PO Box
8 47250, Olympia Washington 98504.

9 So with that, unless my colleagues have any
10 other comments that they wish to make tonight?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. DANNER: All right.

13 Hearing nothing, we will adjourn this meeting.

14 And thank you all for participating. We
15 really appreciate it. This is a very important part of
16 what we do.

17 So with that, thank you.

18 We're adjourned.

19 (Public Comment Hearing adjourned at 7:07 p.m.)

20 -o0o-

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF PIERCE

I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Public Comment Hearing, on January 24, 2023, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 31st day of January, 2023.



Tia B. Reidt

/S/ Tia B. Reidt
Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798
NOTARY PUBLIC, State of
Washington.
My Commission expires
5/15/2026.