Donna Albert

Hi, Donna Albert. I'm a, I'm commenting as a private citizen. Um So, um although uh there's unlimited liability for the harms from a spill (and I'm just speaking about pipelines here that's what I know the best), that doesn't ensure that the people Washington won't be stuck with the costs. That's what insurance is for. So uh if the industry can't afford the insurance, um and if a transition is needed, it uh seems like that should be provided. And uh we should be requiring the cost of an actual maximum worst case spill, so obviously at least a billion dollars would have to be covered. But uh, and also I'm observing that the 300,000 that you chose 300 million that you chose from the California example is actually 600 600 million. I'm I’m getting my numbers screwed up because I can't see. Is actually uh 600 million today right am I am I using the right numbers? And then uh, so that's already um, outdated. So just a CPI, which I'm assuming is a a consumer price index wouldn't be enough to catch up on that. Um So anything less than 100% reliable insurance coverage for a maximum spill is actually a subsidy and the actual cost of these um industry operations um must be must be associated so that so that uh we're not subsidizing and encouraging to continue, but I understand you need um, continuity and you don't want to exceed their capacity to buy the insurance in the short term. You've got to put them on a timeline where they see within a short number, short number of years that they will have to provide that so that they can decide whether they can continue to operate and how to how how, what kind of a transition they have to make. Uh Thank you.