

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Dalton <davedalton3@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:09 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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. As a PSE customer, I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 13 AM 8:51  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

David Dalton  
10619 Sierra Dr E  
Puyallup, WA 98374-2457

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara Leen <macleighin@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:09 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Barbara Leen  
13420 90th PI NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034-1869  
(425) 823-2786

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Nina French <snowflakeschance@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:09 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:55  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Nina French  
10627 61st Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98178-2415

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Shirley Snyder <shirleytsnyder@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:09 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:52

Shirley Snyder  
3850 Klahanie Dr SE Apt 22-203  
Issaquah, WA 98029-5647  
(206) 422-3396



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeffery Kelly <jeffery.m.kelly@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:41 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:52  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Jeffery Kelly  
8010 S Thompson Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98408-4113

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lyn Gardner <gardnerlyn2@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:41 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:55  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Lyn Gardner  
21121 77th Pl W Apt 5  
Edmonds, WA 98026-7127  
(425) 672-7690

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Francesca Rossellini <francesca.rossellini@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:40 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:52  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Francesca Rossellini  
5016 Fairwood Blvd NE Apt 242  
Tacoma, WA 98422-2147

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Mullen <maryetienne24@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:40 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 8:52  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Mary Mullen  
2905 Vallette St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-1841  
(360) 733-6572



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Richard Nish  
<nish.richard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 AM 9:25

Richard Nish  
14651 Forest Glen Rd SW  
Port Orchard, WA 98367-9473

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Hilarie Cash <hilariecash@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

2013 AUG 13 AM 9:25  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Aug 13, 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,

Hilarie Cash  
PO Box 1685  
Duvall, WA 98019-1685  
(425) 844-9137

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara Robinson <bobbierobin@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

2013 AUG 13 AM 9:25

Aug 13, 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,

Barbara Robinson  
403 173rd PI NE  
Bellevue, WA 98008-4130  
(206) 719-9626

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara Rosenkotter <skye@ucdavis-alumni.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Barbara Rosenkotter  
201 Crest Drive  
Deer Harbor, WA 98243



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Anne Hinnendael <ahinnendael@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:41 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Anne Hinnendael  
4657 S Garden St  
Seattle, WA 98118-3840

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sharon Willard <meeshon41@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:41 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14

Sharon Willard  
19109 58th St E  
Lake Tapps, WA 98391-8881

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jennie Adams  
<peacelovejennie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:41 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14

Jennie Adams  
3009 Wilson Ave  
Bellingham, WA 98225-7643  
(360) 715-9905

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Millie Magner <milliemagner@clearwire.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Millie Magner  
4228 28th Pl W  
Seattle, WA 98199-1441  
(206) 283-3451



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jennifer Trahan <11liveloughlove22@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:15  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Jennifer Trahan  
5601 N 37th St  
Tacoma, WA 98407-2666  
(253) 355-2905

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tim Kearney <timkearney02@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:15  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Tim Kearney  
2005 18th Ave NE  
Issaquah, WA 98029-7375  
(425) 444-2029

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Quentin Bergmann <quentin827@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:15  
RECEIVED  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Quentin Bergmann  
4006 NE 138th Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98682-6935  
(360) 835-2692

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jonathan Scanlon <scanlon.jonathan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

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

I moved to the Pacific Northwest three years ago and was drawn to this area due to the natural beauty. The proximity of great state parks, national parks, mountains, lakes, the Sound, and the Pacific, to the great city of Seattle is an asset that we should cherish. Continuing to utilize coal in our energy systems threatens the beauty of our land.

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.

2013 AUG 13 PM 2:13

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,

Jonathan Scanlon  
2631 Mayfair Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98109-1851



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Susan Willis  
<jimandsgwillis@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:13  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Susan Willis  
2124 Park St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-2833

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ronald Digiacommo <mrDIGIACOMO@q.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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.

Thank you.

2013 AUG 13 PM 2:13  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Sincerely,

Ronald Digiacomo  
2307 22nd Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112-2604  
(206) 322-2987

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathy Partida <kathypartida@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:13  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Kathy Partida  
6180 93rd Ave SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040-5046  
(425) 899-3888

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Cheryl Laura Marlow <rkndoopsie@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:11 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:13  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Cheryl Laura Marlow  
4804 66th Ave E  
Puyallup, WA 98371-3732  
(253) 209-1362



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Denk  
<bob.denk@frontier.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14

Robert Denk  
14928 Westwick Rd  
Snohomish, WA 98290-6164  
(360) 563-2602

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tara Trimmell <taratrimmell@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Tara Trimmell  
8719 Quinault Dr NE  
Olympia, WA 98516-5827

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lenore Sharp <lenoreland@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:10 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:14

Lenore Sharp  
4255 S Spencer St  
Seattle, WA 98118-2731

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kwame Opoku <kwame410@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:43 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Kwame Opoku  
9025 W Shorewood Dr  
Mercer Island, WA 98040-6263



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Margaret Thomas <margaret@turingmachine.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:42 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:12

Margaret Thomas  
1030 Bonnie Brae St  
Walla Walla, WA 99362-1331  
(509) 529-4314

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ernie Robeson <ekrobeson@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:41 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:12  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Ernie Robeson  
15504 N Fircrest Cir  
Spokane, WA 99208-8791  
(509) 467-4723

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kristin Patterson <kristin.d.patterson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:12  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Kristin Patterson  
917 S 30th Pl  
Renton, WA 98055-5031

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lowell Hargens <hargens@uw.edu>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:12

Lowell Hargens  
2440 E Aloha St  
Seattle, WA 98112-4120



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jon Chouinard <jgchouinard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:40 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

As a Puget Sound Energy customer, I am very disappointed that PSE 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 13 PM 2:13  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
UTILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON STATE

Jon Chouinard  
1622 SW 350th St  
Federal Way, WA 98023-6916

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Brianna Kohlenberg <itsbri01@q.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 10:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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.

2013 AUG 13 PM 2:12  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

It is time for customers to stand up and be heard! NO MORE COAL! There are healthier, safer ways to obtain energy...wind and solar being the easiest. Please be a change agent and show the rest of the country how it is done.

Sincerely,

Brianna Kohlenberg  
15217 63rd Street Ct E  
Sumner, WA 98390-2623  
(206) 459-4833

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lucinda Saue <lumalasa@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:25 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:11  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Lucinda Saue  
14114 S Shoreview Dr  
Medical Lake, WA 99022-9345  
(509) 299-7771

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lynne Oulman <lynneoulman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:23 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Lynne Oulman  
816 14th St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-7440  
(360) 961-5447



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathryn Schetzer <kschetzer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:20 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:11  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Kathryn Schetzer  
923 Liberty St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-5632  
(360) 733-2764

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Roberts-Ludy <del206@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:50 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

David Roberts-Ludy  
5854 Capt Vancouver Dr  
Langley, WA 98260-9746  
(360) 321-4371

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Eileen Thompson <eileenmctom@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:45 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:11

Eileen Thompson  
PO Box 1738  
Eastsound, WA 98245-1738  
(360) 376-6857

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Roger Kurtz <rrkurtz@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:09

Roger Kurtz  
10215 Lake City Way NE Apt 302  
Seattle, WA 98125-7760



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathryn Oliver <kfoliver@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Kathryn Oliver  
1710 30th Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98199-4221  
(206) 828-9876

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Susan Rees  
<seernasus@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:17 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:09  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Susan Rees  
14905 70th St SE  
Snohomish, WA 98290-6160  
(425) 350-0667

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Alyce Fritch <alycej@u.washington.edu>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:16 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:09

Alyce Fritch  
2160 NE 100th St  
Seattle, WA 98125-7624  
(206) 526-8321

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kirstin Mueller <rubyfly78@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:16 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Kirstin Mueller  
12231 11th Dr SE  
Everett, WA 98208-5920  
(425) 293-5046



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jane Mcalonan <jlmcalonanphotography@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:50 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Jane Mcalonan  
4601 E 18th St Apt 78  
Vancouver, WA 98661-6239  
(360) 696-9718

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Catherine & Hal Martinez <halmartinez@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:49 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:09  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Catherine & Hal Martinez  
765 High School Rd NW  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-1666  
(715) 381-7062

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeanne Oliver <stylelabseattle@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Jeanne Oliver  
8731 Fauntlee Crst SW  
Seattle, WA 98136-2538  
(206) 850-9531

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mike Shaw <mikeshaw69@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:47 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-12076)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10

Mike Shaw  
716 Driftwood Pl  
Edmonds, WA 98020-2663  
(425) 778-9820



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Ward <davidlawrenceward@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:45 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

David Ward  
5306 Steamboat Island Rd NW  
Olympia, WA 98502-8842  
(360) 866-4128

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patricia Jackson <jacksonpatk@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:44 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Patricia Jackson  
23968 NE 127th St  
Redmond, WA 98053-6282  
(425) 881-0451

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathy Hashbarger <kathy@chermak.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:45 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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. It is time to make this not a transition, but a change.

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.

Change begins today or justify the wait.

2013 AUG 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Sincerely,

Kathy Hashbarger  
655 Edmonds Way  
Edmonds, WA 98020-4640

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Seth A Ballhorn <sballhorn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:21 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10

Seth A Ballhorn  
350 Climate Change Ave.  
Bellevue, WA 98044



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dorothy Guth <djguth@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:19 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Dorothy Guth  
716 2nd St  
Kirkland, WA 98033-5551

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Larry Mahlis <larrymahlis@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:19 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10

Larry Mahlis  
9611 12th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-2205  
(206) 522-6012

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Steven Grice  
<stevenlgrice@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 12:15 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 2:10  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Steven Grice  
23 218th Pl SE  
Bothell, WA 98021-8273

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Frelima Dixon <spiritualdixon@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:46 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:13  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Frelima Dixon  
9701 Woodlawn Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103-3548



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Diana Kruis <dlkruis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:45 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:13  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
UTILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON STATE

Diana Kruis  
525 Belmont Ave E  
Apt 11d  
Seattle, WA 98102-6701  
(970) 618-1210

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Yuliya Gorbanyova <gorbanyova@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 1:44 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Yuliya Gorbanyoa  
123 S Main St  
Seattle, WA 98104-2515

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Laurel Felber <laurelfelber@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 3:15 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:16  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Laurel Felber  
2800 Victor St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-2250  
(360) 922-0307

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Catherine Swadley <cathswadley@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 2:46 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:12

Catherine Swadley  
3664 225th Pl SE  
Issaquah, WA 98029-7243  
(425) 392-7753



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Beverly Webber <nwbirders@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 2:46 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:12  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Beverly Webber  
1701 Utah Ct  
Milton, WA 98354-9737  
(253) 344-1256

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sunny Thompson <sunny@wellspringspa.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 2:45 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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 13 PM 4:13

Sunny Thompson  
54922 Kernahan Rd E  
Ashford, WA 98304-9761  
(360) 569-2514

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lynne Shepherd <trollwmn@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 2:15 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 13, 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,

Lynne Shepherd  
17912 McLean Rd SW  
Vashon, WA 98070-5422  
(206) 463-2176