Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Steven Fenwick <fenwizard@earthlink.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 8:17 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1:

Aug 24, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 t showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Steven Fenwick
4929 Cooper Point Rd NW
Olympia, WA 98502-3619
(360) 867-1877

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marsha Adams <adams_marsha@fastmail.fm>
Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2013 4:21 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 25, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Marsha Adams
2201 Maple Valley Hwy Apt 82
Renton, WA 98057-3932
(425) 228-6584

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kenneth Klug <ken_doris@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 5:31 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1:

Aug 23, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Kenneth Klug
3607 152nd St NE
Marysville, WA 98271-8944
(425) 238-5127

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ian Rush <rushia@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 8:03 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 23, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Ian Rush
19026 64th Ave W
Lynnwood, WA 98036-4169

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bill Tirrill <billt@
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 10:33 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 24, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

As a PSE customer, I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its c 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 dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Bill Tirrill
2829 NW 68th St
Seattle, WA 98117-6238

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Hank Walker <w @hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 12:14 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 24, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Hank Walker
91 E Middlepoint Rd
Port Townsend, WA 98368-9636
(360) 280-5956

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jason Warzyn <jawarzyn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 1:16 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 24, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Jason Warzyn
1100 Broadway
Seattle, WA 98122-4202

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kassandra Hill <1992jinx@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 10:17 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1:

Aug 25, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it: 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Kassandra Hill
4428 Point View Walk
Langley, WA 98260-9598

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Raechel Wright <raechel_murphy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2013 9:00 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 25, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Raechel Wright
110 E Dunvegan Rd
Shelton, WA 98584-7161

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jonathan Dann <[redacted]@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2013 6:51 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 25, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Jonathan Dann
22214 109th St E
Buckley, WA 98321-8480
(253) 365-9257

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Angela Murphy <angelashouse@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2013 6:54 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 25, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Angela Murphy
21705 NE 150th St
Woodinville, WA 98077-7290

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of anne bagdon <a @gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 9:21 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1:

Aug 26, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it: 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

anne bagdon
2829 NW 68th St
Seattle, WA 98117-6238

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Keith Fabing <keithfabing@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 11:21 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 26, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Keith Fabing
4816 S Alaska St
Seattle, WA 98118-1851

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Haas <artsquire@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 1:54 PM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-1

Aug 26, 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, an expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dolla dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keepir plant on life support.

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

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax i federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two c President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic c air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. Th 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 pre pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to $125 million in annual costs for disposal of ash. PSE has already paid $25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently fac based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.
No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilitie 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 y 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 impossible for the public to very or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why it 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 tl showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than tr other, clean generation alternatives.

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

Sincerely,

Robert Haas
925 18th St NE
Apt C
Auburn, WA 98002-3374