From:
 Kouchi, Roger (UTC)

 To:
 UTC, DL. Records Center

 Subject:
 Public comment RE: PSE"s IRP

 Date:
 Friday, February 19, 2016 2:26:58 PM

Review Status:Not ReviewedSubmitted Date:02/19/2016Name:Joachim VeithAddress:12956 64th Ave NECity:KirklandState:Washington

Zip Code: 98034 Email Address: joachim@veith-team.net

Primary Phone: 4258206025 Secondary Phone:

Utility Company Name: Puget Sound Energy Support the Filing Issue: No

Contact Method: E-mail

Comments:

PSE writes in the IRP dated 31 July 2015:

From the beginning of this IRP cycle, PSE has made it clear additional future environmental costs and risks were not being addressed. Without consideration of potential future costs, continued operation of Colstrip will look cost effective.

This is exactly the point. PSE has obviously the tools and the data to provide a full risk and cost analysis. Why do they not do it?

What PSE calls a simplified analysis, looks like very much biased towards fossil fuel, and economic and ecologic considerations clearly point both towards renewable energy. It is also in direct conflict with the statement on PSE's web site http://pse.com/aboutpse/EnergySupply/Pages/Resource-Planning.aspx where they state:

The IRP is an exhaustive, research-based examination of the potential risks and opportunities we face in procuring future energy supplies

This statement contradicts the content of the above mentioned IRP statement that it explicitly disregards potential future costs. I encourage PSE (who has, by the way, several good initiatives that are worth supporting) to follow what they write on their own web site.

I do not want to repeat the arguments in the response from the Sierra club and just add the link for your perusal: http://content.sierraclub.org/coal/sites/content.sierraclub.org.coal/files/docs/Sierra%20Club%27s%20Summary%20of%20PSE%27s%20IRP_0.pdf

Thanks for your consideration,

Joachim