

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Hannah Glasser <halalexglasser@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:28

Hannah Glasser  
PO Box 309  
Olga, WA 98279-0309  
(360) 376-3822

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dan & Pat Montague <montague30@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Dan & Pat Montague  
647 73rd Ave NE  
Olympia, WA 98506-9772  
(360) 709-0866

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeannine Wilmes <jwilmes923@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29

Jeannine Wilmes  
13766 Hemlock Dr SE  
Monroe, WA 98272-8300  
(360) 794-1456

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Francis Wood <fbwood@uw.edu>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Francis Wood  
412 36th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122-6416  
(206) 323-2296



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Bosworth <davidlb13310@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29

David Bosworth  
13310 115th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034-2169  
(425) 821-3046

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephen Shaben <shaben@harbornet.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29

Stephen Shaben  
1320 Berkeley Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98466-6794  
(253) 564-2536

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Deborah Efron <catsformede@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12: 28

Deborah Efron  
10129 Main St Apt 307  
Bellevue, WA 98004-6061  
(425) 453-8541

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stuart Mork <morkabu@aim.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 1:29  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Stuart Mork  
7710 31st Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117-4642  
(206) 781-0336



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tim and Judith Prowell <timju@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

We were very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. We urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:29  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Tim and Judith Prowell  
1914 165th PI NE  
Bellevue, WA 98008-2617  
(425) 746-9837

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sophia Torelli <sophiatorelli@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL Records Center

Sophia Torelli  
845 Kirkland Way Apt C  
Kirkland, WA 98033-6338

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ashley Smart <veggtastic@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12: 31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Ashley Smart  
57th Ave Ct E  
Puyallup, WA 98373  
(253) 232-7899

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gladys Chase  
<gypsychase@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Gladys Chase  
14118 81st PI NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034-5077  
(425) 820-1253



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Adrienne Bolach <adbolach@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Adrienne Bolach  
17126 76th Ave W  
Edmonds, WA 98026-5005

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stacey Auger <staceyauger@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Stacey Auger  
3601 NE 205th St  
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155-1573  
(206) 367-3433

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Karen Hall <klhall@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

I pay extra to PSE every month for clean energy. I want and expect clean energy for that extra cash I am paying them not a continuation of coal burning in Colstrip, Montana. Burning coal is the path to environmental destruction. Clean energy gives us a future.

Sincerely,

Karen Hall  
6104 123rd Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98033-8525  
(425) 739-0751

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Julie Hentrich <occasionalresponse@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Julie Hentrich  
PO Box 196  
400 Libby Creek Rd.  
Carlton, WA 98814-0196

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Colleen Johnson <colleenjohnson@dwt.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



Colleen Johnson  
9222 30th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98126-3924

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lloyd Johnston <lajceoigthi@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:08  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Lloyd Johnston  
13421 26th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125-4307  
(206) 367-4841

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marilyn Andrews <andrewsmj1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31

Marilyn Andrews  
611 NW 126th Pl  
Seattle, WA 98177-4435  
(206) 465-1008

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Charles Covello <covello@blarg.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Charles Covello  
2165 N 186th St  
Shoreline, WA 98133-4235

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dan Hess  
<dmhess@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:08 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:08  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



Dan Hess  
1620 45th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98116-1657  
(206) 933-6851

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Libby Hazen <libmh@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:06 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Libby Hazen  
[libmh@yahoo.com](mailto:libmh@yahoo.com)  
116 Bayside Place  
Bellingham, WA 98225

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:31  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
116 BAYSIDE PLACE  
BELLINGHAM, WA 98225

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Littlebird Parks <birdfrog@blackfoot.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:01 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Littlebird Parks  
[birdfrog@blackfoot.net](mailto:birdfrog@blackfoot.net)

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

**Higgins, Joni (UTC)**

---

**From:** Eleanor Parker <ela27prkr@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:58 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Eleanor Parker  
[ela27prkr@juno.com](mailto:ela27prkr@juno.com)  
710--11th Avenue  
Helena, Montana 59601  
406-461-5408

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
MONTANA

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Wade Sikorski <wds@midrivers.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:56 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Wade Sikorski  
[wds@midrivers.com](mailto:wds@midrivers.com)  
1511 Hwy 7  
Baker, Montana 59313  
4067756378

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Dean Littlepage <dljm@bresnan.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:56 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Dean Littlepage  
[dljm@bresnan.net](mailto:dljm@bresnan.net)  
618 W. Curtiss St.  
Bozeman, MT 59715

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Nelson <nelsondave290@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

David Nelson  
109 E 3rd Ave  
Ritzville, WA 99169-1550  
(360) 337-0976



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Taffy Lund <taphin80@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

Taffy Lund  
5010 Normandy Dr SE  
Olympia, WA 98501-5124

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of James French <forrestfrench@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

James French  
9233 Interlake Ave N Apt 301  
Seattle, WA 98103-3345  
(206) 517-2828

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Raymond Ligrano <ligranorm@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Raymond Ligrano  
28815 Vashon Hwy SW  
Vashon, WA 98070-8805  
(206) 463-3145

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dominique Mason <nikkibix@live.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

Dominique Mason  
4426 212th St SW Apt L10  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043-6443  
(720) 227-6225



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Rosita Becker <dipsauce@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Rosita Becker  
4706 Harbour Heights Dr  
Mukilteo, WA 98275-5834  
(425) 787-0129

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tony Buch <maritoni\_buch@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1011 1011

Tony Buch  
6221 35th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-7314

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephen Wille <sawille1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32

Stephen Wille  
704 NE Countryside Dr  
Vancouver, WA 98684-4115  
(360) 260-8882

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ronald Hawk <ronaldhawk@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:32  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Ronald Hawk  
PO Box 33207  
Seattle, WA 98133-0207  
(206) 225-5258



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jordan Robbins <ranzhenhe@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:30  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Jordan Robbins  
10451 NE 204th Pl  
Bothell, WA 98011-2458

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patricia Raamot <pmraamot36@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Patricia Raamot  
1445 NW Turner Dr Apt 4  
Pullman, WA 99163-3742  
(509) 332-1376

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kent Huxel  
<sierraclubdotorg@gorgewarehouse.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Kent Huxel  
1934 E Isaacs Ave # 192  
Walla Walla, WA 99362-2255

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Rebecca Anshell Song <ranshell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:37

Rebecca Anshell Song  
9409 178th PI NE Unit 4  
Redmond, WA 98052-0805  
(425) 269-1451



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dorethea Simone <light1lamp@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33

Dorethea Simone  
2828 NE Everett St Unit 20  
Camas, WA 98607-9204  
(541) 400-8935

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kim Beaubien <kbeaubien3@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33

Kim Beaubien  
11527 Highway 99 Apt E102  
Everett, WA 98204-7864  
(586) 255-1522

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Walter Jorgensen <waltjorgensen@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Walter Jorgensen  
823 North St SE  
Tumwater, WA 98501-3526  
(360) 867-0138

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of John Flynn <jlflynn4@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 5:33

John Flynn  
2510 W Bertona St Apt 325  
Seattle, WA 98199-2243  
(206) 683-4577



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Everett Simila <esimila@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur within the next two decades. As President Obama noted in a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33

Everett Simila  
26180 Tuckerman Ave NE  
Kingston, WA 98346-9414  
(360) 297-8279

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Terri Jones <nekhebet@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33

Terri Jones  
7731 28th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117-4539

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephen Friedrich <stephenf1@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Stephen Friedrich  
2425 Western Rd  
Steilacoom, WA 98388-1317  
(253) 278-4856

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Suzzanne Scauzillo <suesuki04@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Scauzillo  
1959 12th Ave W Apt 1n  
Seattle, WA 98119-2771  
(206) 298-2988



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Constance Childs <renachilds@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Constance Childs  
3411 Bridgeport Way W Apt 1  
University Place, WA 98466-4512  
(253) 348-4090

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mark Koehnen <mdfek87@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:48 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Mark Koehnen  
PO Box 185  
Quincy, WA 98848-0185

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Chris Frame  
<chris.frame@rainierconnect.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:33  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Chris Frame  
1907 63rd Ave NE  
Tacoma, WA 98422-3627  
(253) 927-1988

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Pauline Druffel <pjdruffel@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:34

Pauline Druffel  
930 S Cannon St Apt 13  
Spokane, WA 99204-4372  
(509) 624-2127



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Anne Baker  
<crowwoman@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:34  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Anne Baker  
2616 Neals Ln  
Vancouver, WA 98661-5113  
(360) 600-6189

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Toni Montgomery <teddybear.bandt@q.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Toni Montgomery  
13816 SE 35th St  
Vancouver, WA 98683-7790  
(360) 891-6136

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kenneth Stinnett <krstinnett@centurytel.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:34  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Kenneth Stinnett  
119 Belcher Rd  
Randle, WA 98377-9012  
(360) 494-0745

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bruce Smith <brucesmith@rainierconnect.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 11, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 12:34  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Bruce Smith  
PO Box 1676  
Yelm, WA 98597-1676