

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Kouchi, Roger (UTC) on behalf of Public Involvement (UTC)  
**Sent:** Friday, October 11, 2013 2:59 PM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** FW: Puget Sound Energy 20yr IRP should not include the Colstrip MT power plant

**From:** Gaythia Weis [mailto:gaythia@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 11, 2013 11:55 AM  
**To:** Public Involvement (UTC)  
**Subject:** Puget Sound Energy 20yr IRP should not include the Colstrip MT power plant

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
P.O. Box 47250  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250  
Docket #UE-120767 (and UG-120768)

2013 OCT 11 PM 3:43  
RECEIVED  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to express my concern regarding the Integrated Resource Plan submitted by Puget Sound Energy.

My husband and I am a PSE residential customers. We have participated in our city's Community Energy Challenge. After evaluation of our home, we installed a new furnace and water heater. We also have made lighting, insulation and heat leakage efficiency improvements. We purchased energy efficient refrigerator, washer and drier units. We plan to make further such improvements. We also pay an extra "Green Power" fee to support wind energy usage by PSE. We are happy to support forward looking utilities and also reap the personal budget benefits that come from wise energy usage.

Going forward, certainly over a span of 20 years, the outdated, polluting, and climate impacts of CO2 production regarding the Colstrip power plant make this a poor choice, both from economic and environmental perspectives.

There are many additional items that should have been included in Puget Sound Energy's Integrated Resource Plan calculations. Total long term costs of continued usage of this old coal burning facility need to be requested by your agency to ensure that a complete and fair ISP document is submitted by Puget Sound Energy.

These items include but are not limited to:

1. Health impacts on local Colstrip, Northern Cheyenne, area ranchers, and other nearby Eastern Montana residents.
2. Groundwater pollution and other issues stemming from coal fly ash disposal. This analysis should not only include fines and impacts from current problems but also a plan with cost analysis for mitigation and restoration going forward.
3. The impacts of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, particulate matter, and other toxics, and likely increasing costs of stack pollutants removal. These stack pollutant impacts have occurred and will occur over a wide area. Increasing abilities to analyze such pollutants are likely to lead to increasing levels of regulatory and mitigation requirements.

4. Increasing costs of mining and subsequent land reclamation efforts. These reclamation efforts will be made more difficult as plants like Colstrip are contributing to global climate change. Such changes will be likely to make this area drier with more erratic storm patterns and even harder to reclaim.

5. CO2 production future costs in a world in which increasing awareness of anthropogenic climate change are very likely to lead to market pricing of CO2 production, and also CO2 sequestration requirements.

6. Our Pacific Northwest area is dependent on an overall healthy environment. Ocean acidification is a concern with serious implications for our shellfish industry. Droughts affect our wheat, apple and other farmers. Changes in storm patterns affect all of us. This old coal fired power plant is a contributor to CO2 related effects of global climate change. These impacts need to be in the accounting for the IRP.

The items above, should, if proper accounting methods are used, make it wise for PSE to shift away from coal and towards alternative energy production methods.

The Integrated Resource Plan for Puget Sound Energy ought to include a plan for the removal of this Colstrip coal fired energy source from their energy stream.

Sincerely,

Gaythia Weis  
1713 Edwards Ct.  
Bellingham WA 98229