

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Helen Budzynski <h.bud.zyn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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,

Helen Budzynski  
2734 NE Lillehammer Ln  
Poulsbo, WA 98370-9084

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kirk Taylor <william@fairpoint.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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,

Kirk Taylor  
12525 Morris Rd SE  
Yelm, WA 98597-9201  
(360) 400-0334

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Janet Saupp  
<janetksaupp@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Janet Saupp  
8135 NE West Port Madison Rd  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-3044  
(206) 780-1769

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Bill <mary.e.bill@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Mary Bill  
11717 15th Ave NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98332-9621  
(253) 857-7555



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Schleicher <studiothyme53@q.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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,

Mary Schleicher  
1010 E Half Mile Rd  
Port Angeles, WA 98362-8928  
(253) 851-3446

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Allen Elliott <allendelliottaia@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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 2:45  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Allen Elliott  
101 Shelter Bay Dr  
PO Box 743  
La Conner, WA 98257-9533  
(360) 466-4461

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lisa Thomas <lrhody@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:15  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Lisa Thomas  
14137 235d Pl SE  
Issaquah, WA 98027-6441

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bernard Heisterkamp <bheister@mindspring.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:48 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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:15  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Bernard Heisterkamp  
PO Box 8024  
Bonney Lake, WA 98391-0999  
(253) 862-4168



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Marilyn Webb <dm\_webb@live.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:35 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.

--  
Marilyn Webb  
[dm\\_webb@live.com](mailto:dm_webb@live.com)  
4522 36th Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98199  
206-285-3672

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Beverly Fox <beverlyfox@mt.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:31 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.

--  
Beverly Fox  
[beverlyfox@mt.net](mailto:beverlyfox@mt.net)  
1423 Stuart  
Helena, MT 59601  
406 443-3581

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Carol Marsh <carolnhero@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:29 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.

--  
Carol Marsh  
[carolnhero@msn.com](mailto:carolnhero@msn.com)  
420 E. Front St. #2  
Missoula, MT 59802  
406 543 1038

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:45  
OFFICE OF THE  
SECRETARY OF  
STATE

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Justin Williams <strandell409@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

Justin Williams  
412 Robinson St  
Everson, WA 98247-9790  
(360) 966-0997

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tracy Millard <tracy@travelteam.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:16  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Tracy Millard  
1102 129th St E  
Tacoma, WA 98445-2912

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephen Brown  
<acushiatsu@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:16  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



Stephen Brown  
401 Grow Ave NW  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-1733

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of John Kersting <johnkersting@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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),

Puget Sound Energy is an irresponsible consortium of what should be criminal level fleece artists who get your rubber stamp to steal more and more of our money for shoddy service, higher rates to defeat citizen actions, giveaway programs that still rely on coal as it's source and environmental irresponsibility.

Is this what your intended purpose is supposed to accomplish? We are tired of this hypocritical set of standards when we should be making progress to get off fossil fuels as was demanded and promised since the Energy Crisis of the 1980's. Were we just being lied to or did government agencies like yours just get infiltrated and answer only to big, entrenched businesses?

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.

As I and most of the people I know see it, the UTC is incompetent, immoral, ignorant, cowards or some combination thereof. All we can do is hope to force the issue when things go horribly wrong or more horribly wrong.

Sincerely,

John Kersting  
2404 Olympia Ave NE  
Olympia, WA 98506-4845  
(360) 352-1225

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lorena Havens <info-lorena@peoplesguide.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:16

Lorena Havens  
PO Box 179  
Acme, WA 98220-0179

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gloria Sayler <gloriasayler@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:40  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Gloria Sayler  
Agate Pass Rd NE  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-1042

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of ahnne ross <ahnne1961@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:46  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



ahne ross  
8309 Zangle Rd NE  
Olympia, WA 98506-9746  
(360) 943-1169

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ilene Molinder <nicholsandmolinder@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:16  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Ilene Molinder  
437 Bowes Dr  
Fircrest, WA 98466-7047

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Timothy Alexander <tim\_alexander@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:46  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 4TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TEL: 206.462.2000  
WWW.UTC.WA.GOV

Timothy Alexander  
3968 Bancroft Rd  
Bellingham, WA 98225-8506

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Melissa Hinwood <melissa.l.hinwood@boeing.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

Melissa Hinwood  
12921 150th St SE  
Snohomish, WA 98290-6712  
(425) 238-9998

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Brianna Pfeninger <bpfeninger88@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:46  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



Brianna Pfeninger  
4022 E B St  
Tacoma, WA 98404-1435  
(253) 888-3175

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of James Parzino <jparzino@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:16  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

James Parzino  
128 12th Ave  
Kirkland, WA 98033-5517

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Cory Breedlove <cory.breed@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

Cory Breedlove  
18577 NE 67th Ct  
Redmond, WA 98052-6711

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Julia Brayshaw <alchemia33@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:46  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TEL: 206.462.2000  
WWW.UTC.WA.GOV

Julia Brayshaw  
424 38th Ave NE  
Olympia, WA 98506-2418  
(360) 943-3752

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Matthew Logalbo <mjlogalbo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:46  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



Matthew Logalbo  
2539 13th Ave S Unit 203  
Seattle, WA 98144-8005  
(508) 736-2113

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Blair Anundson <breed4b@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 2:17  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Blair Anundson  
1612 E 17th Ave  
Spokane, WA 99203-3635  
(509) 944-0829

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jon Sequeira <jonsequeira@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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 explained 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.

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
OFFICE OF THE  
CLERK OF THE  
UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION  
3100  
WEST  
MAYHEW  
AVENUE  
SEASIDE  
WA 98148

This is not where we want our 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,

Jon Sequeira  
1107 31st Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144-3216  
(401) 281-9137

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Meyer <mfmeier@wildblue.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Mary Meyer  
442 Grant Rd  
Beaver, WA 98305-9603  
(360) 327-0725

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lance Ulich <ulich1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:19 AM  
**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,



Lance Ulich  
4604 34th Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98199-1135  
(253) 245-7816

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Margie Strainer <mrsstrainer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:05 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.

--  
Margie Strainer  
[mrsstrainer@gmail.com](mailto:mrsstrainer@gmail.com)  
212 E. Nicklaus  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
406-755-0887

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
UTC DL Records Center

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** David Ellenberger <davidellenberger@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:00 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.

--  
David Ellenberger  
[davidellenberger@hotmail.com](mailto:davidellenberger@hotmail.com)  
3010 Webster St  
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
RECEIVED  
JONI HIGGINS  
11/11/2013

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sue Malek <suemalek@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:59 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.

--  
Sue Malek  
[suemalek@gmail.com](mailto:suemalek@gmail.com)  
1400 Prairie Way  
Missoula, MT 59802  
406-370-2424

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Barbara Boettcher <bboettcher108@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:55 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.

--

Barbara Boettcher  
[bboettcher108@hotmail.com](mailto:bboettcher108@hotmail.com)

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1011 2ND FLOOR  
300 N. GALELLO ST.  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Jim Davis <bnbadenuf22@bresnan.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 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.

--  
Jim Davis  
[bnbadenuf22@bresnan.net](mailto:bnbadenuf22@bresnan.net)  
2004 Phoebe Dr  
Billings, , Montana 59105

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
MONTANA

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Julie Bergevin <juliebergevin@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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 2:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Julie Bergevin  
6046 126th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98033-8516  
(425) 576-9787



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Seth Donohue <donohue.seth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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,

Seth Donohue  
5841 5th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98107-2118

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joanna Idczak <tzakfamily@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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,

Joanna Idczak  
PO Box 1907  
Anacortes, WA 98221-6907

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Theresa Jacobs <theresat4@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:41  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Theresa Jacobs  
3216 NW Esplanade  
Seattle, WA 98117-2625  
(517) 490-6522

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Polly Tarpley <tarpleypolly@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 8:47  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
PSE-120767

Polly Tarpley  
848 NW Bracken Ct  
Poulsbo, WA 98370-6956  
(360) 394-8344



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Babak Emami <sacredgate@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:47  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
UTILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON STATE

Babak Emami  
4128 SW Kenyon St  
Seattle, WA 98136-2333  
(206) 933-5917

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Richard Cardin <cardinr@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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,

Richard Cardin  
301 E Roy St Apt 39  
Seattle, WA 98102-5931

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Michaela Fox <invent.tune@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:18  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Michaela Fox  
13003 Rainier Acres Rd SE  
# A  
Rainier, WA 98576-9714

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Steve Coyote <slcoyote@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:50 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:18  
OFFICE OF THE  
CLERK OF THE  
COMMISSION

Steve Coyote  
492 Newport Way NW  
Issaquah, WA 98027-3121  
(425) 427-0134



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lynn Lennox <lynn@blanchardchapel.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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 a PSE customer who is VERY disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years. I want help from you to make my power source more responsible.

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,

Lynn Lennox  
PO Box 153  
Bow, WA 98232-0153  
(360) 770-7417

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Eric Anderson <eric.anderson7@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Eric Anderson  
8445 17th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106-2307  
(206) 767-7101

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Teerran Campbell <terran.campbell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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,

Teerran Campbell  
4109 SW Morgan St  
Seattle, WA 98136-1825

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeffrey Booth <solowanderery2k@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:4  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
UTILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON STATE

Jeffrey Booth  
2509 Caitlin Ct SE  
Olympia, WA 98501-7621  
(360) 250-3370



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Richard Stockton <freepress@richardleestockton.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:18  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TEL: 206.462.2000  
WWW.UTC.WA.GOV

Richard Stockton  
23918 Locust Way  
Bothell, WA 98021-9241  
(425) 487-9004

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bryan Dorwin <bryan.k.dorwin@boeing.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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 plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:48  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
UTILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON STATE

Bryan Dorwin  
1713 105th Avenue Ct E  
Edgewood, WA 98372-1500

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Peter Kuentzel <kp223@bellsouth.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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,

Peter Kuentzel  
PO Box 580  
Lopez Island, WA 98261-0580

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Erica Forrest <family.forrest@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:49 AM  
**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,

Erica Forrest  
4000 SW 107th St  
Seattle, WA 98146-1646



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sue Bartlett <gfenderson@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 2:39 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.

--  
Sue Bartlett  
[gfenderson@msn.com](mailto:gfenderson@msn.com)

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:49  
RECEIVED  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of William Conlen <bconlen@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 2:38 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,

William Conlen  
4507 N 33rd St  
Tacoma, WA 98407-4725  
(253) 752-1358