

Whipple, Amanda (UTC)

From: Kouchi, Roger (UTC) on behalf of Public Involvement (UTC)
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 8:43 AM
To: UTC DL Records Center
Subject: FW: Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

From: Amy Mower [mailto:mattp@re-sources.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 7:38 PM
To: Public Involvement (UTC)
Subject: Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Dear Chairman Danner, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission: As a customer of PSE, I believe that it's important to include the estimated social and economic cost of carbon in any final Integrated Resource Plan submitted to your commission. I am committed to investing in clean, renewable energy and reducing our reliance on carbon intensive sources of energy like the Colstrip Generating Facility. We all must prepare for a carbon-constrained future, and 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. I would like to see PSE transition beyond coal energy and ask the UTC to: - Include a carbon price in their cost-benefit equation for the continued operation of the Colstrip plant. - 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. - Consider the potential for regulatory costs associated with compliance to federal haze and air toxics rules. - Account for the increasing costs of mining coal to supply Colstrip; and - Require PSE to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, as PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners. Thank you,

Amy Mower

PO Box 2004
Maple Falls, Washington