

Anthony Wright

Um, actually Ed's letting me borrow his link. This is Anthony Wright, uh, city council, uh, for the City of Enumclaw. And my name is spelled A-N-T-H-O-N-Y W-R-I-G-H-T. Um, thank you for this, uh, this briefing and this opportunity to speak, um, as well as your presentation. Um, the comments that I'd like to make, um, are regarding what I initially asked in the Q&A position which was around the estimated average, um, allowance price. When the house bill 5126 was passed at \$22.78 and then department of college's analysis coming in at 160% increase at \$58.31. That for the citizens of Enumclaw is gonna result in a 23% rate increase to cover the capital needed to purchase the credits, um, necessary to be in compliance with this program. Uh, we do budgets in October and then we have to set prices in November. So by this happening for this current timeline, we have no choice, but to increase the rates that must in order to make sure that we have enough capital, we don't create, we don't keep a lot of capital on hand in order to. make sure-- for-for a program such as this, we have a minimum of 10% for when it comes to reserves. Um, when you Institute a program like this, I don't think that consideration was taken into small city utilities, like the City of Enumclaw or the City of Ellensburg, because essentially what you're doing is you're taking away our customers, and then pushing them on tips because something like Puget Sound Energy, which then leaves the city only one choice in order to retain those customers, which is then to enact the state laws, which allows the cities to purchase transmission lines and infrastructure from entities like Puget Sound electricity. Enumclaw is a 100% heat load. We have no major industry. Uh, we have no asphalt plants, no metal pro-processing plants, no other types of other, um, processing plants. And the baseline that you have set for us is 22,774 metric tons, which is only 274 metric tons within that 10% variance that the rule calls for which basically is about 91 households. The department of ecology has stated that the rule-making was not supposed to impact small businesses or that the house bill itself was not meant to impact small businesses, but as was answered during like the Q&A portion, it will in fact, uh, small businesses. And in fact, for the City of Enumclaw, it will impact over 500 small businesses because as the costs are passed on to us, the supplier, we then have to pass the costs onto the small businesses, as well as the households. Enumclaw is made up of 21% to 23% senior citizens, which means that we will be impacting quite a few, uh, large percentage of our population and affecting them in a negative way along with that 23% increase. Um, that doesn't make a lot of sense to me, um, why we would pass this cost burden on because the reality is that it's a lot different to build new all-electric in a household versus the cost of abandoning existing equipment to install new all-electric equipment. So that 21% to 23% of our population doesn't have the \$30,000 to \$40,000 necessary per household to replace infrastructure like a heat pump, a water tank, a-a cooktop, um, it's-it's really unrealistic. And I think that-tho-those types of costs aren't factored into when you consider the size of our municipality or the size of the City of Ellensburg. Um, and my final comment is just to point out that, um, you know, low income is, was defined though this was not supposed to affect low-income citizens. Um, King County, uh, area median income is \$99,000, and 80% would be considered low income at \$79,200 and the- Thank you. All right. I'd be quick. Um, is that the city of Enumclaw is at \$61,000, so we are well below the low-income standards for this not to impact low income. And I would just ask that you reduce the amount of compliance obligations required for smaller LDCs or city LDCs, so we can better facilitate this type of program or not be included at all. Thank you.