

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Kouchi, Roger (UTC) on behalf of Public Involvement (UTC)
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 8:41 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: FW: Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Joni – There are another 142 comments that came into our public involvement inbox. I will forward them to you one at a time. Thanks.

Roger

From: Adina Parsley [mailto:mattp@re-sources.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 4:08 PM
To: Public Involvement (UTC)
Subject: Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Dear Chairman Danner, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission: I am extremely interested in seeing PSE transition beyond coal energy and therefore I'm asking the UTC to consider multiple costs, social and economic, when considering Colstrip in any final Integrated Resource Plan submitted to your commission.. As a PSE customer who has requested (and pays for) 100% clean energy, I am committed to investing in clean, renewable energy and reducing our reliance on carbon intensive sources of energy like the Colstrip Generating Facility. I ask that all final recommendations in the IRPs coming before the UTC include a broad examination of carbon pollution, new federal air quality standards, and other environmental costs associated with the continued operation of the Colstrip facility. One example, include regulatory and legal costs associated with the disposal of toxic coal ash as a hazardous substance. Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. Another example, consider the potential for regulatory costs associated with compliance to federal haze and air toxics rules. All costs of carbon must be considered. Thank you,

Adina Parsley

Ferndale, Washington