

From: Wally Macfarlane <wally@geograph.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/9/2006 5:22:51 PM
Subject: Dear Utah Public Service Commission,

Dear Utah Public Service Commission,

As a life-long citizen of Utah and as a long-term customer of Rocky Mountain Power, I'm very concerned with plans to build 3 new coal fired power plants that have no way of capturing CO₂ emissions. As an alternative, I would like Rocky Mountain Power to make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy options, which are far less damaging to the natural resources and cheaper than long term coal-based power plants.

It is my understanding that these 3 new plants would add an additional 13 million tons of CO₂ into the atmosphere which would further increase the threat of global warming. I respectfully request that the Commission seriously consider this issue in light of how it may affect the long-term welfare of Utah's citizens and Rocky Mountain Power's customers. Is this the legacy that we want to leave our children with -more coal power plants? I don't think so!

Sincerely,

William W. Macfarlane

Wally Macfarlane, GISP
GIS/Photogrammetry Analyst
GEO/Graphics, Inc.
90 West Center Street
Logan, Utah 84321
Voice: (435) 753-5429
Fax: (435) 753-5831
wally@geograph.com
www.geograph.com

This message was sent using IMP, the Internet Messaging Program.

From: "Alexander Lofft" <alofft@corporateregroup.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/9/2006 6:21:21 PM
Subject: Rocky Mountain Power - future plants

Dear Merilee,

I apologize for writing this in an e-mail first rather than a letter, but it seems public comment to the proposed new coal fired power plants requires urgent response.

Corporate Real Estate Group and Sun Peak Partners work in commercial real estate brokerage and development in the greater Salt Lake City MSA, with a largely commercial and industrial focus. We and our clients (some of which are out of state

but considering Utah) are already aware and concerned about the air quality in the Valley as the inversions are hard to miss (and showing up in Park City now as well).

We fear that the consequent impact on public health through deteriorating air, water and land quality will also impact the area's growth and affluence. In order to attract a high quality workforce, we cannot risk spoiling that which makes Utah attractive as a place to work and live, and risk our competitiveness with neighboring states that are more sensitive to these issues and demands.

Rocky Mountain Power has established the Blue Sky program to gauge interest in alternatives, and I believe the success of this program demonstrates the public's interest in cleaner power generation (although there are many people not even aware of it - I have been surprised to introduce it for the first time to several business and building owners in Salt Lake City who have responded well upon learning about it). I personally, and my business participate in the program in part to demonstrate the demand for cleaner power, and we want to see this and alternatives like it more visible publicly.

We believe Rocky Mountain Power (and PacifiCorp)'s recent rate change request represents a unique opportunity to make a push for cleaner power - or at least a more diversified portfolio of regional power generation. If missed, we all will have to

deal with the consequences for a long time (over the estimated 40+ year life of these power plants, 2-3 generations of people). We urge that the full costs be accounted for in the decision process on the types of power plants considered and their related rate proposals.

To that end, we urge two things,

1) that Rocky Mountain Power include in its cost justification and rate structure for any power plant proposal, the following, currently externalized, costs:

a) a bona fide cost assessment of the pollution effects in the region

- i) including upstream extraction impacts, and
- ii) downstream disposal of solid and liquid waste,
- iii) and downwind airborne effects, including acid rain, and the threat to our watersheds,

b) a similar cost assessment of the impact on public health,

NOX, SOX, Mercury, and microfine particle dispersal - (an issue over which even residents of Washington DC are suing a local power plant)

c) and, knowing we will be facing a carbon tax during the lifetime of these plants, and likely sooner than later - accounting for the cost of carbon trading on our rates (since we will likely have to pay higher rates for them to internalize that. Doing otherwise, and we are simply subsidizing coal and all its negative effects now, and not being honest with the public about these cost choices).

2) that as part of the mix for any approvals, the current cap on "net-metering" be eliminated, thereby allowing more clean micro-power generation (which the current cap dissuades).

Only if the health and environmental costs are accounted for in their rate structure will we get the true cost of the proposed coal fired plants, and only then will the true difference between coal and its alternatives (natural gas, solar, wind, even nuclear) be on an apples to apples basis and be truly fair to the public.

Thank you for considering these comments, which I will also include in a letter

Alexander Lofft, MBA

Principal & Broker

<<http://www.corporateregroup.com>> Corporate Real Estate Group, LLC

2430 Meadows Drive

Park City, Utah 84060

Phone: 435-659-9399

Fax: 435-608-6314

E-mail: ALofft@CorporateREGroup.com

part of the

International Tenant Representative Alliance

North America, Latin America, Europe, The Pacific Rim

From: DebbieDoom <lazyedna@gmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/9/2006 6:56:26 PM
Subject: public comment on power supply

As a Rocky Mountain Power customer, I am concerned about this utility's commitment to the preservation of a habitable planet when competing with profit motivation.

Most educated consumers are well aware of the negative consequences of burning coal for electrical generation. I'm not going to bother listing them.. we both know the list is long and ugly.

When we are told, by Nobel prize winning economist Milton Friedman, that the corporation cannot be ethical, its only responsibility is to make a profit, or when energy task force meetings are kept secret from the public by the vice president who is a former CEO of a major energy corporation whose stock has quadrupled since the start of the Iraq war, we, the consumers and the people of the United States, are left with the concept that the power structure (all power) cares only for the money it can leech from hardworking middle class Americans.

I therefore write this realizing that my opinion is of tiny consequence..

I can't understand why anyone would ignore what seems to me to be a sacred duty to preserve a world for our children that is at least as hospitable as the world our grandparents left us. Or perhaps Milton Friedman's pithy aphorism overrides the love of a grandparent for a grandchild. That is our choice. Great Profit? Or a planet that can support and sustain a quality life for the next generation and the one after that, and so on.

I am not asking PacificCorp to give up all profit. I understand the capitalist system ... However, even Adam Smith knew that unregulated capitalism was a social nightmare. Profit needn't be obscene.

From my perspective, wind power seems to be an excellent resource for electricity. I could list the reasons, but AWEA.org has already done it. Also, CONSERVATION is highly underrated as a solution to our energy needs. Yes, we all recall our dear vice president (former CEO of Halliburton, whose stock has quadrupled since the start of the Iraq war, and let us not forget, FIVE deferments when it was HIS turn to fight for his country) pontificating with authority that conservation is a great personal virtue but doesn't work for the real world. You should believe him, he has more money than I do. And more power. But I have grave doubts about his ethical conduct.

Well, I think I have covered the points I felt important to illuminate. It would be nice if my opinion mattered. It would almost be like living in a democratic republic.

Sincerely
Sara Straw

From: "Sean Brown" <Sean@SeanJBrown.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 10:22:38 AM
Subject: Concerned consumer

To whom it may concern:

- As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, I am very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing C02 capture.
-
- * As a customer, I would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.
- * These three benchmark sources will add approximately 13 million tons of C02 to the already burgeoning problems of high C02 levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

Regards, Sean Brown

From: <ACGOODSELL@aol.coms>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10.10/2006 10:28:22 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Ms. Livingston

I am concerned about adding new coal-fired power plants in Utah. I believe that we should look to the real energy future and not continue our reliance on fossil fuels. Not only is there a finite quantity of these energy sources, but they contribute to global warming by the addition of carbon dioxide and also further reduce air quality in Utah by the addition of a wide variety of toxins in the plume that each plant generates.

I own stock in PacifiCorp, but I strongly believe that there is more to planning for energy needs in the future than relying on the continued development of fossil fuel dependent sources, the old stand-bys. If Utah is going to move ahead, if Utah is going to leave the state in quality condition for future generations, then we can no longer be so strongly influenced by the current energy development lobbying efforts. We need to think broadly about what is best for us, now and in the future.

Sincerely,
Marion Klaus

2730 Forest Spring Way
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

801-467-2946

CC: <marionklaus@comcast.net>

From: "Nancy Bostick-Ebbert" <nancyb@sbt.net.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/11/06 10:47:51 AM
Subject: Coal, energy and CO2

Re: Coal, energy and CO2

I am writing to inform you of my concerns and ask that you consider these as you make decisions regarding new energy resources. Most Americans are very aware of the effects of air pollution on our health and, in a larger sense, the health of our planet.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that we must develop clean energy sources and reject those which, while convenient, can only exacerbate our problems. Since its inception, I have purchased blocks of the "Blue Sky" power offered by UP&L and would like the opportunity to do more. Please invest more right now in clean and renewable energy---and, I for one, would be willing to sign on to a program where I could donate a small amount each month for your research and include it with my bill.

Instead of spending more money for coal-fired plants that add tons of CO2 to our atmosphere and contribute to global warming, please lead the way in offering clean energy to all of your customers. Consider allowing us to donate money for research whether as an individual or perhaps you could create a "investor" status for those of us willing to do this and our reward could come later in the form of clean and renewable energy. I would dare to bet that you have thousands of customers who would donate small amounts of money for something that would clean up the environment and offer a safer place for our children and grandchildren.

I look to you to be innovative. To be a flagship in environmental responsibility and believe that in the long run, not only will this make sense for those of us who enjoy breathing, but will translate into new inventions that will make a lot of money for Rocky Mountain Power. Please consider what happened when Steve Jobs had an idea---the billions of dollars that happened as a result of a new approach and the countless technological advances that were made because he was willing to think outside the box.

I appreciate your time.

Sincerely Yours,

Nancy Bostick-Ebbert
1 North 2500 West
Vernal, UT 84078

"If you want another to adopt your beliefs, you must first become someone they wish to emulate ..."
-nancy bostick-ebbert-

From: "Georgia Rush" <georgia@pureutah.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 10:49:20 AM
Subject: No More Coal Power Plants in Utah

Dear Merilee Livingston-

As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, and an individual with asthma, I am very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing CO₂ capture. As reported by Scientific American in their June 2000 issue, asthma was rare in 1900, but now it has grown into an epidemic with more than 15 million people affected and 5,000 deaths attributed annually in the U.S. alone. Environmental pollutants and chemicals are two of the many causes of asthma.

As a customer and a purchaser of the "Blue Sky" program, I would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts. These three benchmark sources your corporation is planning to expand will add approximately 13 million tons of CO₂ to the already burgeoning problems of high CO₂ levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Georgia Rush

Sales Agent

Assistant to Craig & Delia Reece

Prudential Utah Real Estate

Saddleview Office Park

2200 Park Avenue, Bldg. B

Park City, Utah 84060

Direct Phone: 435.647.8070

Direct FAX: 435.647-8092

Toll Free: 800.553.4666 ext. 8070

Office Fax: 435.649.5696

From: "Connie Elliott" <connieelliottRemax@msn.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/102006 11:41:36 AM
Subject: Proposal 2012 Pacific Power

Hi:

It has been brought to my attention that Pacific Power/Rocky Mountain Power is looking to build 3 power plants. I have a few concerns:

First, is coal burning an efficient and healthy source of energy? Could we be looking at renewable sources and other cleaner sources? I know the pollution is getting worse in our valley ... would this be health conscious.

Second, what is the co2 effect on our LUNGS and well being? Are these harmful emissions being recovered???

Third, what is the cost of power plants vs. other sources.

What are the utilities doing for long term development, needs of our growing population and cleaner sources of energy that may be available but not popular with the our legislators and utilities? ie; 300+ days of sunshine/solar, geothermal/taping the earths temp.

Thanks for listening to my concerns.

Connie

From: "hugh smith" <hughsmith@wfrmls.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 12:09:18 PM
Subject: future power sources

Dear Ms Livingston and Rocky Mountain Power,

I want you to be aware of my desire for, and willingness to pay for cleaner and renewable power sources.

I am concerned that the proposed coal powered plant expansions will cause irreparable damage to our environment for many years to come and I would prefer that an investment, instead, be made in renewable power production, even if that would mean higher power rates. I am sure that you would agree that a long term solution to our increasing power needs would best serve us all if it is clean and renewable. We have a responsibility to future generations as well as to our pocketbook and the stockholders.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Hugh Smith
hughsmith@wfrmls.com
Phone: 801 272-8100
Fax: 801 278-9003
Toll Free: 877 972-8100

--

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.1.408 / Virus Database: 268.13.1/470 - Release Date: 10/10/2006

From: "Chris Nelson" <cknl976@hotmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 12:44:09 PM
Subject: PacifiCorp Request for Proposals 2012

To whom it may concern:

I oppose the proposed power plant expansions in favor of expanding Utah's renewable energy resources.

As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, I am very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing CO₂ capture.

I would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.

These three benchmark sources will add approximately 13 million tons of CO₂ to the already burgeoning problems of high CO₂ levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

Sincerely,
Chris Nelson
Lehi, Utah

From: "Travis Jensen" <tmoney526@hotmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 12:55:37 PM
Subject: Alternative Energy

Hello, I wanted to give my two cents on RMP/Pacificorp's plans to add more coal generating capacity to meet future energy projections. I am becoming more and more alarmed at the prospect's of global warming, and think that we should be doing everything we can to meet our future needs (and replace our current sources, for that matter) with wind, solar, and conservation instead of more coal plants. And I'm willing to pay more for electricity from these sources if that's what it takes.

So those are my two cents. Please, let's change where we're getting energy from and invest in clean energy rather than coal.

Thanks,

Travis Jensen
Salt Lake City

Find a local pizza place, music store, museum and more ... then map the best route! <http://local.live.com>

From: "Bridgette Steffen" <cbridgettsteffen@gmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/ 2006 1:56:05 PM
Subject: Docket # 05-035-047

Ms. Livingston

I am writing to express my opinion about the investments that Rocky Mountain Power is planning to make towards increased use of coal power in my state of Utah. I am against the use of more coal power plants being built, as renewable energy is a cleaner alternative and one that is economically viable. Wind power is certainly cost competitive with traditional power generation. I would also like to see the Utilities invest in large-scale photovoltaic or concentrating solar power installations, and I would like to see RMP and other utilities put money towards incentives for solar power. As a resident of Utah, I am deeply concerned about where we get our power from and want it to come from as much renewable sources as possible. It is also the responsibility and duty of the utilities in this state to promote and incentivize energy efficiency measures in the commercial and residential sectors.

Thank you so much,

Sincerely,

Bridgette Steffen
bridgettsteffen@gmail.com
Park City, Utah
435-640-7558

From: "Bridget Kadzius" <bridget@townbridgerealty.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 2:01:03 PM
Subject: NO NEW COAL PLANTS!

Docket #: 05-035-047

As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, I am very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing CO₂ capture.

As a customer, I would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.

These three benchmark sources will add approximately 13 million tons of CO₂ to the already burgeoning problems of high CO₂ levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahans and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

I wish to encourage Rocky Mountain Power to invest in renewable energy sources, such as wind power!

Thank you,

Bridget Kadzius

Town Bridge Realty Group

435-901 -0399

<mailto:bridget@townbridgerealty.com> bridget@townbridgerealty.com

From: Bob Brister <bbrister@greens.org>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 2:40:53 PM
Subject: Rocky Mountain Power

To: Merilee Livingston

I believe the PSC should see to it that Rocky Mountain Power makes a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources. These are proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.

I take global climate disruption seriously. I think the PSC should, also. Please deny any new coal-fired power plants in Utah.

Sincerely,
Bob Brister
1102 S800 E #A
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

From: "Jonny Totten" <jtotten@pureutah.com>
To : <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/1/0/2006 3:33:04 PM
Subject: 3 new power plants fired with COAL????

Please do everything you can to stop Pacific Corp from using coal to power their 3 new plants. What are they thinking?? Well, I guess they're not thinking. Please encourage them to find more environmentally favorable sources -- now and forever. Maybe all of the commission and Pacific Power should go see Al Gore's movie "An Inconvenient Truth". I'm serious. Thank you very much.

Jonny Totten, CRS
Associate Broker
Prudential Utah Real Estate
2200 Park Ave, Bld. B
Park City, UT 84068
435-647-8094 DIRECT
435-649-5696 FAX
435-640-6001 CELL

From: "Changxin Fang" <cfang2@gmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 4:50:54 PM
Subject: stop the coal plants

Dear Ms. Livingston,

I strongly oppose PacifiCorp's proposal to build more coal power plants in Utah. The burning of coal to produce electricity would emit an additional 18 million tons of carbon dioxide per year. Carbon dioxide is the main contributor to global warming, which is threatening the stability of our ecosystem and precipitating the happening of many disastrous events. Even though coal may be cheaper, the cost to the environment and the eventual damage rising sea levels and global warming will do to the global economy is far higher than the extra price we may have to pay for cleaner electricity right now. Once these plants are built and in operation, it will be very hard to shut them down. Burning coal is also the cause of acid rain, which kills forests and aquatic life.

We simply cannot afford to be so short sighted. We have to take into account the long term costs of our actions. At this time, when we already know so much about the dangers of coal burning, and have the means of producing electricity more cleanly, it is simply immoral to then chose the alternative that will destroy our environment and make the planet more unlivable for our children. Both 1st world and developing countries are switching to cleaner renewable energies. We cannot persist in the old ways when it is known that those ways offer only temporary solutions and long term tragedies.

I implore that the heads at PacifiCorps will reconsider their decision. Because the US has not ratified the Kyoto protocol and there are no laws to prevent this action, individuals and corporations must take it upon themselves to do the right thing, for the benefit of us all.

Sincerely,
Changxin Fang

Instructor at University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

From: Julie Monahan <monahanj@us.ibm.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 3:56:53 PM
Subject: FORESIGHT

As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, you are very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing CO2 capture.

As a customer, you would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.

These three benchmark sources will add approximately 13 million tons of CO2 to the already burgeoning problems of high CO2 levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

Comments can be sent by email to the Utah Public Service Commission's Merilee Livingston: mlivingston@utah.gov

Or you can call the Commission direct at (801) 530-6716

Tim Wagner

Director, Utah Smart Energy Campaign

Utah Chapter Sierra Club

2120 S. 1300 E., Suite 204

Salt Lake City, UT 841 06

office: 801/467-9294

cell: 801/502-5450

fax: 801/467-9296

Please consider alternatives to the proposal to build 3 new coal powered plants!!!

As a customer of Rocky Mountain Power, I am very concerned with the proposed investments in new coal plants. I expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address the critical issue of global warming. In addition, the utility's investment in these plants, which likely won't come on line for at least six years, represents billions of ratepayer's money. That money could be better spent on energy efficiency and developing renewable energy in Utah. Such clean investments will serve as a hedge against price volatility in fossil fuels and also protect consumers from the costs of future carbon taxes and/or carbon caps implemented by the federal government as a way to deal with global warming.

Let's demonstrate leadership and consider how investments in sustainable and renewable sources can position Utah for the future. Coals is the past ... it's time to move in another direction!

Thank you

Julie A. Monahan

Business Value Team
Worldwide Industry Sales

IBM Software Group

877-503-6976

Mobile: 435-731-0226

Email: monahanj@us.ibm.com

From: "snowowl sor-lokken" <voltairescorvette@hotmail.com.
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/11/2006 10:30:25 AM
Subject: coal fired plants

To whom it may concern,

As a concerned citizen of Utah, I do not think it is wise to add three additional coal plants to our state. Already our air quality leaves much to be desired, these new power plants would add an additional 18 million tons of carbon dioxide to our atmosphere. Not only do these emissions contribute to global warming but also to a host of respiratory illnesses. Due to these issues, I believe it is unwise to further pollute our air. There are better ways, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency, with many of these options already being used around the world. Please take the health of the planet and the people living on it into consideration and do not build these plants.

Sincerely,

SnowOwl Sor-Lokken
141 East 2nd Ave #804
SLC, UT 84103

All-in-one security and maintenance for your PC. Get a free 90-day trial!
http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnkwlo005000000lmsn/direct/0l/?href=http://www.windowsonecare.com/?sc_cid=msn_hotmail

From: <lofftpc@msn.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>, <tomward@allwest.net>
Date: 1011 112006 9:38:09 AM
Subject: WSJ.com - Hong Kong's Polluted Air Erodes City's Competitive Edge

*Please note, the sender's email address has not been verified.

Ms. Livingston,

attached is an article from the Wall Street Journal that highlights the erosion of business competitiveness with increased pollution, something we need to avoid as Rocky Mountain Power's 3 coal plant proposal is considered. We need to diversify our power generation from a single fuel and must include substantial renewables into the mix (especially since Utah enjoys good sun and wind and nearby natural gas!).

If you are having trouble with any of the links in this message, or if the URL's are not appearing as links, please follow the instructions at the bottom of this email.

Title: WSJ.com - Hong Kong's Polluted Air Erodes City's Competitive Edge

This article will be available to non-subscribers of the Online Journal for up to seven days after it is e-mailed.

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to access the sent link:

<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=viewThis&etMailToID=190615890&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to SAVE THIS link:

<http://www.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThisPopupApp?clickMap=saveFromET&partnerID=150&etMailToID=190615890&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to forward this link:

<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=forward&etMailToID=190615890&partnerID=150&pt=Y>

Email pages from any Web site you visit - add the EMAIL THIS button to your browser, copy and paste the following into your Web browser:

<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=browserButtons&pt=Y>

Instructions:

.....

If your e-mail program doesn't recognize Web addresses:

1. With your mouse, highlight the Web Address above. Be sure to highlight the entire Web address, even if it spans more than one line in your email.
2. Select Copy from the Edit menu at the top of your screen.
3. Launch your Web browser.
4. Paste the address into your Web browser by selecting Paste from the Edit menu.
5. Click Go or press Enter or Return on your keyboard.

From: "KJ" <kj050@hotmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 5:10:08 PM
Subject: Isn't It Time to Say No to Coal?

Greetings!

I recently learned of plans by Rocky Mountain Power/Pacificorp to invest in expanding current coal- powered plants near Delta & Huntington, Utah and Rock Springs, Wyoming.

I'm terribly concerned that they are turning to coal-powered plants as the answer to meet demand. What I really think needs to happen is investment in researching energy efficiency and developing new inroads to Utah renewable energy. Though it might take initial effort to get these sources to produce profitably, I believe they present a better long-term solution and possibly even a cheaper alternative to coal.

I've been told that the proposed plants have no way of addressing C02 capture. Certainly I'm concerned about that- in addition to the fact they will emit other toxins into our air, including mercury, sulfur dioxide, ozone, and nitrogen oxides.

As a fellow Utahn, I hope that you will consider Rocky Mountain Power's proposal carefully, as it stands to affect the long-term welfare of those who live here in this beautiful state. I think it's time to look at alternative solutions to energy.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Kristyn Jones

Share your special moments by uploading 500 photos per month to Windows Live Spaces

<http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwsp007000000lmsn/direct/OI/?href=http://www.get.live.com/spaces/features>

From: <franklin@biology.utah.edu>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 6:15:35 PM
Subject: Pacificorp request 2012 to Utah Public Service Comm

Dear Ms. Livingston and Utah Public Service Commission:

You are being petitioned by Pacificorp to approve its long-term purchase of electricity from proposed coal-fired power plants in Utah: IPP#3 near Delta and Hunter #4 near Huntington. So far as I know, these expanding facilities are planned as standard coal-fired facilities, i.e. CO₂ emissions not captured, toxic emissions not scrubbed. A long-term agreement with Pacificorp will assure that these NEWLY CONSTRUCTED coal facilities will propagate their undesirable pollutions long into the future.

Probably you know that California has recently ratified a law that prohibits them from any new contracts with out-of-state generators whose power comes from traditional coal technology. The loss of California as a customer is driving Pacificorp to put long term contracts with IPP into place even before the new power plant constructions are approved. A little peculiar, to my mind.

It would be better to postpone ANY new power contracts until there is agreement that all new coal-burning plants be committed to design with new technologies that greatly reduce CO₂ and toxic emissions.

Over a decade ago Tampa Electric demonstrated the feasibility of "intensified gasification combined cycle" process to yield clean power from coal. Yes, it is more expensive: 20% perhaps. But how can we calculate the long term costs of CO₂ upon our atmosphere, of toxics in our air creating health problems?

Please help us to find a path to a desirable future environment.
This is NOT the time to perpetuate our old mistakes into the future.

Sincerely,
Naomi Franklin
1411 Utah St #4
Salt Lake City, UT 84104

From: "Kathy Mears" <kathleenmears@bigplanet.com>
To : <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 8:05:06 PM
Subject: Coal Plants

Please no more coal plants! Let's look towards cleaner sources !
Kathy Mears
Park City,Utah

From: "Richard Spotts" <spotts@infowest.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/10/2006 9:07:34 PM
Subject: Please oppose PacifiCorp's proposal for three new coal-fired power plants

October 10,2006

Merilee Livingston

Utah Public Service Commission

Dear Ms. Livingston:

As a Utah resident and Rocky Mountain Power customer, I oppose and urge the Utah Public Service Commission to deny PacifiCorp's proposal to rely on three new coal-fired power plants. At this time of increasing problems with global warming and airborne mercury contamination of aquatic ecosystems and dependent fish and wildlife species, it would be immoral and foolish to expand our reliance on coal burning to generate electricity. Instead, this investment capital can and should be directed to stimulate increased use of clean, renewable, and sustainable energy sources like solar, wind, and geothermal, and to increase the efficiency of existing uses.

As you know, PacifiCorp, the parent company of Rocky Mountain Power, has filed a draft Request for Proposals 2012 with the Utah Public Service Commission. As a regulated utility, PacifiCorp is required by the PSC to file this document so the public is aware and can comment on where the utility intends on buying its power and supplying its customers. In this recently-filed draft RFP, PacifiCorp has identified three major coal-fired power plants, nearly 1700 megawatts, as its "benchmark options," which are the Company's proposed plans for meeting the electricity requirements and the terms for soliciting competing bids from electricity suppliers.

The three sources include a 340 MW share of the proposed Intermountain Power Plant expansion near Delta, UT (the total size of the expansion, referred to as IPP#3, would be 950 MW), a new 600 MW unit at the Hunter Generating Station near Huntington, UT (referred to as Hunter#4), and a new 750 MW unit at the Jim Bridger Station in Rock Springs, WY (referred to as Bridger#5).

These three new power plant expansions, if built, would collectively emit an additional 18 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year. PacifiCorp's portion of that CO₂ footprint would amount to approximately 13 million tons. CO₂ is the main culprit in global warming. In addition, these new facilities would emit hundreds of thousands of tons other toxins, including particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, ozone, mercury, and others. In addition, the utility's investment in these plants, which likely won't come on line for at least six years, represents billions of ratepayers' dollars. That money could be much better spent on energy efficiency and developing renewable energy in Utah. Such clean investments will serve as a hedge against price volatility in fossil fuels and also protect consumers from the costs of future carbon taxes and/or carbon caps implemented by the federal government as a way to deal with global warming.

In short, the Utah Public Service Commission should not support a continuation or even worsening of the documented problems, but rather play a leadership role in expediting the transition to the urgently needed solutions. It is time to shift energy generation away from non-renewable, polluting sources that contribute to global warming and toward renewable, clean sources that do not contribute to global warming. Thank you very much for your consideration

Sincerely,

Richard Spotts

1125 W. Emerald Drive

St. George UT 84770-6026

spotts@infowest.com

From: "director" <director@recycleutah.org>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 1011 112006 12:52:06 PM
Subject: COMMENTS ON COAL FIRED POWER PLANTS

Dear Merilee Livingston,

I am writing to let you know of my concerns regarding the possible installation of three additional power plants in Utah. I am concerned for the welfare of the people in the Delta, Huntington and Rock Springs area.

We in Park City depend on snow, white snow for our winter season. If we want snow at all, Utah cannot have coal-fired power plants.

I am a Rocky Mountain Power customer and am very concerned with the investment in risky coal plants and the possible CO2 emissions. As the executive director of a non profit which educates people on alternative energy processes, I know that wind and solar power is the better way for us, for our children, for this state and for the economy.

Utah will be a healthier place to visit, we have five national parks after all, for the many millions of visitors we try to entice to come here.

I do hope that my concerns are heard.

Thank you, Insa Riepen

Recycle Utah

1951 Woodbine Way

P.O. Box 682998

Park City, UT 84068

<http://www.recycleutah.org>

Phone: (435) 649-9698

Fax: (435) 658-1 530

From: "Dwight Barrett" <Dwight.Barrett@zionsbank.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/12/2006 7:45: 18 AM

We need more power. I wish Rocky Mountain power would use natural gas. The main thing is to generate more power. America needs more power. There is not such thing as global warming. Global warming is some thing dreamed up by idiots to take the minds of Americans off of more important issues.

Wagner and his organization are out of touch with reality. All his organization does is bitch about progress. His organization never has an alternative. All they do is bitch. I suggest Mr. Wagner shut up or put up a solution of his own and of course be willing to pay for it.

I have a wonderful idea that would provide us with more power and have a lot less polution. If Rocky Mountain power would like to have me tell them what it is they just need to ask. My idea would be the best of both worlds. It would provide long term power with little or no polution.

Thank you

This is my opinion and my opinion only.

Dwight J. Barrett
801-755-9744

Power Company Seeks to Acquire More Coal-fired Energy
Oct 11, 2006 by Julie Rose
(KCPW News) The parent company of Rocky Mountain Power is preparing to acquire its next major power generators. A draft of the proposal establishes coal-fired power as the benchmark for the acquisition. The Sierra Club's Tim Wagner says it's a step in the wrong direction: "In terms of addressing global warming, this is a major build-out for traditional coal," says Wagner. "We should be looking at other sources for energy besides this Industrial Age technology."
Rocky Mountain Power spokesman Dave Eskelson says the company will gladly consider other forms of power in the proposal, if they meet the output and cost requests. But he says renewable energy sources like wind and water won't be sufficient to meet all of the company's power needs, so coal will remain a part of the mix.
The Utah Public Service Commission is taking public comment on the request through Friday. Email comments to mlivingston@utah.gov.

CC: <dbarrett123@comcast.net>, "Gregory Barrett" <gbarrett@d251.kl2.id.us>, "Roger Barrett" <BARRETTTR@mail.d321.kl2.id.us>, <CHECOLBAR@aol.com>

From: "Bo Andreini" <boandreini@comcast.net>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/11/2006 6:14:34 PM
Subject: no coal please

Dear Pacific Corp decision makers,

I am a Rocky Mountain Power customer, a mother of two beautiful children and a concerned human being. My main concern, is living on an earth that provides me and my family and their families, with clean air to breathe, healthy water to drink, and untainted food to eat. These are the 3 things we "need" in order to exist on this planet! Everything else is fluff.

The thought of pumping out 18 million more CO2's into our already stressed and polluted earth scares me. But there isn't time to be scared. It is time for action. Action in the form of renewable energies- wind, sun..clean and sustainable. We are a young society. We as Americans have the opportunity to be the pioneers of taking care of the earth- the earth that provides us with food, oxygen and water so that we may exist.

WE HAVE A CHOICE! Lets wake up and choose clean air, water, dirt.

The great minds will come together and instinctively choose to revolutionize our way of obtaining energy. Take a stand and PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THESE POWER PLANTS.

Utah is a "pretty great state" lets take of her and our neighboring "cowboy state" Wyoming.

Thank You for listening!

Greta Andreini
Bo Andreini
Olivia Andreini
Isabella Andreini
and generations to come

From: "Alexander Lofft" <alofft@corporateregroup.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/11/2006 5:09:42 PM
Subject: Wall Street Journal Article - HTML form

Marilee, here is that very timely article that illustrates the potential pollution threat to Salt Lake City of PacifiCorps proposal (just as we're hitting a good stride in economic development)

Hong Kong's Polluted Air
Erodes City's Competitive Edge

By JANE SPENCER
October 9, 2006; Page B1

HONG KONG -- During the past five years he spent in Time <<http://online.wsj.com/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=twx>> Warner Inc.'s office here, Todd Hodgson watched the city's skyline disappear under a gray cloud of smog.

As the pollution worsened, Mr. Hodgson, a vice president at the company, began suffering from coughs and sore throats. His children, three and six years old, were constantly at the doctor's office with asthma and chest infections.

[Hong Kong]

People wearing surgical masks are a routine sight in Hong Kong's most polluted districts.

Last summer, Mr. Hodgson decided he'd had enough. "The money and the perks just weren't enough to keep us there anymore," says Mr. Hodgson, who relocated his family to Australia in August. "You can drink bottled water. But with the air -- you have to breathe it."

Three years after an outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome battered Hong Kong's economy, the city is facing a new challenge. Senior executives at companies including Morgan <<http://online.wsj.com/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=ms>> Stanley and Marriott <<http://online.wsj.com/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=MAR>> International Inc. are increasingly vocal about the negative impact of pollution on business. Like Mr. Hodgson, a growing number of foreign executives -- and even some companies -- are leaving the city, citing the air pollution.

There is good reason for their concern. Last week, the World Health Organization released new air-quality guidelines and issued a warning about the health consequences of urban air pollution. WHO says levels of particulate matter -- the tiny flakes of soot, dust and ash that are considered the most dangerous form of air pollution -- shouldn't exceed 20 micrograms per cubic meter. Roadside particulate levels in Hong Kong averaged 75 micrograms per cubic meter last year, according to Civic Exchange, a local think tank.

Hong Kong's overall air quality has been declining for the past six years as booming industry in mainland China sends clouds of soot and toxic gases wafting across the harbor into the city. In addition, local power plants and diesel-fueled traffic fill the narrow streets with foul air that gets trapped at street level by the city's skyscrapers. Some residents walk about wearing surgical face masks. Researchers at Hong Kong University say local air pollution contributes to at least 2,000 premature deaths a year.

[Hong Kong]

A tourist takes pictures at Hong Kong's Victoria Harbor last week with the city skyline in the background shrouded in smog. Pollution has become a touchy issue for some foreign companies and executives operating in the city. Poor air quality reduced visibility to less than roughly a half a mile on more than 50 days last year.

While Hong Kong still has better air quality than many other cities in Asia, including Beijing, it lags far behind most cities in the developed world with equally sophisticated economies. Levels of particulate matter are roughly 40% higher in Hong Kong than in Los Angeles, the most polluted city in the U.S.

"There are days when you can almost see the grit in the air," says Cliff Taylor, human-resources director for Eli Lilly & Co.'s Asia operations, who says he knows of half a dozen people who have left Hong Kong because of the pollution.

Some companies worry pollution could cost the city its competitive edge. A recent survey of American business leaders in the region, conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, found that 79% of executives felt environmental issues are making Hong Kong less attractive to foreign companies. Recruitment firm ECA International recently began advising companies to give an additional 5% "hardship allowance" to employees moving to Hong Kong from the U.S., because of pollution.

"As a regional finance center, Hong Kong needs to get its act together, and quickly," say Rob Morrison, chief executive at brokerage firm CLSA Asia-Pacific Markets, who says pollution is making it harder to fill jobs in Hong Kong.

Hong Kong has long been a prime location for companies doing business in Asia, because of its simple tax structure, transparency and central location. It is all the more prized these days as a financial center for its proximity to mainland China. The city of 6.9 million -- where some 1,200 U.S. companies have foreign offices -- has traditionally been a cushy posting for American workers, offering all the comforts of home, from HBO movies to Starbucks frappuccinos.

And there is little concrete evidence that Hong Kong's economy is suffering from the pollution. Office rents here have surged 37% in the past year, and hotel occupancy is up 11%. The number of foreign and mainland-China companies with offices in Hong Kong rose 1.3% in the past year, according to the government.

"It is simply not having an impact on foreign investment," says Mike Rowse, director-general of Invest Hong Kong, a government agency that promotes investment. "Companies go where they can make a profit. It's Economics 101."

Still, earlier this year, U.S. hedge fund Concordia Advisors opened its new Asian office in Singapore instead of Hong Kong for "lifestyle reasons," including Singapore's cleaner air. U.S. hedge fund Stark Investments recently opened a satellite office in Singapore because several fund managers with families wanted to leave Hong Kong.

Teall Edds, portfolio manager at Stark and a former marathon runner, is one of them. Mr. Edds says in Hong Kong he was "banished to the treadmill," and his children were regularly kept in during school recess when the air pollution was bad.

Critics say Hong Kong's failure to address the pollution is a problem of will, not resources. "This is a very socially and economically advanced community," says Anthony Hedley, a professor of public health at the University of Hong Kong Medical Centre. "Whenever there is political will to do something, it is done in double-quick time But on this issue, the government appears to be digging in and denying the fact that there is an urgent imperative to act."

In fact, after years of shrugging off the problem, some of Hong Kong's leaders are finally acknowledging it. Victor Fung, a government adviser and chairman of the Greater Pearl River Delta Business Council, recently admitted that "people are not coming to Hong Kong to take that job because their kid has asthma." Hong Kong's top official, Donald Tsang, is under pressure to come up with proposals to address the problem.

Hong Kong's Environmental Protection Department has taken some steps to reduce pollution, including converting the city's taxi fleet and public minibuses to liquefied petroleum gas, which is cleaner than diesel. The agency recently announced a plan to review its current air-quality objectives, which haven't been updated since 1987, but it says the city is still years away from meeting WHO guidelines.

Meantime, the departures continue. Sarah Hauser, a 36-year-old voice-over actor from California, moved here in 1995 and never thought she would leave. But when her infant daughter developed a chronic cough, Ms. Hauser started packing for San Francisco. "I love Hong Kong," she says. "But I care about my baby's health more. And I can't even take her for a walk outside here."

Write to Jane Spencer at jane.spencer@wsj.com

Alexander Lofft, MBA

Principal & Broker

<<http://www.corporateregroup.com>> Corporate Real Estate Group, LLC

2430 Meadows Drive

Park City, Utah 84060

Phone: 435-659-9399

Fax: 435-608-6314

E-mail: ALofft@CorporateREGroup.com

part of the

International Tenant Representative Alliance

North America, Latin America, Europe, The Pacific Rim

From: Philip Emmi <emmi@arch.utah.edu>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/11/2006 5:06:43 PM
Subject: PacifiCorp's Draft Request for Proposals 2012

Regarding PacifiCorp's Draft Request for Proposals 2012, may I respectfully suggest that their permit be conditioned by the following two stipulations: (1) PacifiCorp shall join the Chicago Climate Exchange, a voluntary carbon emission credit exchange market, and (2) PacifiCorp shall purchase annually carbon emission reduction credits sufficient to fully offset that year's anticipated CO2 emissions.

Prof. Philip C. Emmi, Director
Urban Planning Program
College of Architecture + Planning
University of Utah
375 S 1530 East RM 235 AAC
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0370
(801) 581 -4255 (801) 916-0342 cell
emmi@arch.utah.edu
www.arch.utah.edu

From: Randy Colquitt <randycolquitt@yahoo.com>
To : <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/12/2006 10:09:48 AM
Subject: Coal Plants

Please note our concerns.

1. As customers of Rocky Mountain Power, we are very concerned with investments in risky coal plants that have no way of addressing CO₂ capture.
2. As customers, we would also like to see Rocky Mountain Power make a larger investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.
3. These three newly planned coal plants in Utah will add approximately 13 million tons of CO₂ to the already burgeoning problems of high CO₂ levels in our atmosphere and global warming. We should expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

We already have more than enuf pollution in our area! We recently vacationed in Washington State and welcomed the ability to breathe FRESH, CLEAN air.

Don't pollute our state more than it already is!!!

Randy and Stephanie Colquitt
801/292-3476
Bountiful, UT 8401 0

.....

All-new Yahoo! Mail - Fire up a more powerful email and get things done faster.

From: isabella des etoiles <esho37@yahoo.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 1011 212006 2:38:33 PM
Subject: coal-fired power plants in Utah

Dear Ms. Livingston and Utah Public Service Commission:

You are being petitioned by Pacificorp to approve its long-term purchase of electricity from proposed coal-fired power plants in Utah: IPP#3 near Delta and Hunter #4 near Huntington. So far as I know, these expanding facilities are planned as standard coal-fired facilities, i.e. CO₂ emissions not captured, toxic emissions not scrubbed. A long-term agreement with Pacificorp will assure that these NEWLY CONSTRUCTED coal facilities will propagate their undesirable pollutions long into the future.

Probably you know that California has recently ratified a law that prohibits them from any new contracts with out-of-state generators whose power comes from traditional coal technology. The loss of California as a customer is driving Pacificorp to put long term contracts with IPP into place even before the new power plant constructions are approved. A little peculiar, to my mind.

It would be better to postpone ANY new power contracts until there is agreement that all new coal-burning plants be committed to design with new technologies that greatly reduce CO₂ and toxic emissions.

Over a decade ago Tampa Electric demonstrated the feasibility of "intensified gasification combined cycle" process to yield clean power from coal. Yes, it is more expensive: 20% perhaps. But how can we calculate the long term costs of CO₂ upon our atmosphere, of toxics in our air creating health problems?

Please help us to find a path to a desirable future environment. This is NOT the time to perpetuate our old mistakes into the future.

Isabella des Etoiles
1411 South Utah Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Make PC-to-Phone Calls to the US (and 30+ countries) for 2c/min or less.

From: "Stanton Jones" <stanton@parkcity.tv>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 9:41:02 AM
Subject: be more responsible!!

I have been told you are planning three new power plant expansions, which if built, would collectively emit an additional 18 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year.

Are you nuts? Please reconsider and be a more responsible community leader. You have a responsibility to our environment to find cleaner solutions to energy.

thanks.

Stanton D. Jones

From: Sally Elliott <sally@tellsally.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 7:15:30 AM
Subject: Request for Proposals 2012

Request for Proposals 2012 from PacifiCorp, the parent company of Rocky Mountain Power is ill-advised because three proposed coal-fired power plants listed as "benchmark options" will add approximately 13 million tons of CO₂ to the already burgeoning problems of high CO₂ levels in our atmosphere and global warming.

My husband and I made a commitment several years ago to purchase wind power and would like to see a larger share of electricity available from energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources, which are quickly proving to be far less risky and in many cases cheaper than long term coal-based contracts.

As a public utility regulator we expect the PSC to look at this issue in light of how it may affect the long term welfare of Utahns and Rocky Mountain Power's customers, and to also consider the utility's direct responsibility to address this critical issue.

Sally Elliott
2690 Sidewinder Dr.
Park City, UT 84060
home: 435-649-5712
mobile: 435-640-3759
email: sally@tellsally.com

From: Kathy Van Dame <dvd.kvd@juno.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 2:15:27 PM
Subject: Rocky Mountain Power - new coal

Utah Public Service Commission,

As a customer of the recently renamed Rocky Mountain Power, and a long time subscriber to the Blue Sky program, I ask that you use your authority to protect Utahns from the risks inherent in building new coal power plants when the pendulum is swinging toward vigorous action to reduce green house gas emissions.

It is difficult in the current time to discern the best way forward, but it is becoming increasingly clear that old ways of doing things will not provide a safe world for our descendants. We must increase the amount & variety of renewables, increase the amount and diversity of Demand Side Management, increase various conservation measures like combined heat & power.

If old technology is built, Utahns will live with the pollution and GHG liability for decades. Please do not approve the construction of new conventional coal.

Peace,
Kathy Van Dame
1148 East 6600 South #7
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121
(801)261-5989 dvd.kvd@juno.com

Telephone Comments from MICHAEL KAESKAE received 10/13/06 at 4: 10 p.m. by M. Livingston

MICHAEL KAESKAE
4067 HILLTOP COURT
PARK CITY, UT 84098
(239) 940-0583

Mr. Kaeskae is a Utah customer of PacifiCorp and a former government employee. He is a father and grandfather and he thinks that investing in coal is a bad idea for the future. The Earth is the only planet we get and we need to avoid using fossil fuels for our energy. Teams of independent scientists have proved that fossil fuels as energy sources are not good for the environment. It is unwise to not invest in our children and grandchildren's future. We need to be looking for alternative energy sources for the sake of the future. We are all on this Earth together and building new coal power plants is a bad idea for everyone's future.
(As received by M. Livingston, 10/13/06,4:10 p.m.)

From: kevin cummins <cummins.kevin@yahoo.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 6:49:53 PM
Subject: coal fired power plant expansion

I am writing to express my concern about expansion of coal fired power plants in Utah. The global warming crisis demands that any further coal plants be designed to recover carbon dioxide using the latest technology. If existing coal fire power plants are constructed, the retrofits and modifications which will be required in a few years to address global warming will cost much more than if the systems are designed and constructed properly now. I urge you to reject any "traditional" coal fired plant expansion or construction in Utah. Kevin Cummins, 801-363-3622.

.....
Get your email and more, right on the new Yahoo.com

From: James Logan
To : Revelt, Carol; Wilson, Rebecca
Date: 10/13/2006 5:12:05 PM
Subject: Fwd: More Renewables, Less Coal

>>> "Eleanor Kelly" <etk0706@westminstercollege.edu> 10/13/06 9:36 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Logan,

I am writing to support more renewables and less coal in Rocky Mountain Power's electricity production mix. I understand that Utah PSC is accepting comment up until today.

First, it is proven that coal is bad for the environment. Specifically, mercury, a byproduct of coal-fired power plants, directly poisons people and wildlife. Mercury also indirectly poisons people by poisoning their food chain.

Second, the cost of coal is not cheaper than renewables. The cost of coal is not totally accounted for. If my dog bites you, who is responsible for the medical bill? I am (it's my dog ... it bit you). If a coal fired power plant spews out mercury and poisons people and wildlife, who is responsible for preventing that? The coal fired power plant (they're producing the mercury). The cost of coal should be the current cost of producing coal PLUS at least the cost to prevent poisoning the environment. If total costs were accounted for, one could easily see that coal is not cheaper than solar, wind or other renewables. Instead, part of the burden of the cost of coal (mercury poisoning etc) is borne by the environment in the form of degraded support systems, increased medical bills etc. If the source producing these costs (coal-fired power plants etc) is not accountable for them, how will these businesses ever have the chance to control them?

Third, pollution (i.e. mercury) is waste. Waste is, by definition, inefficient. Should businesses not work to be as efficient as possible? If so, coal-fired power plants should account for mercury and other environmental hazards. The cost of mercury and other environmental hazards is whatever it costs not to produce mercury or environmental hazards (i.e clean up, installment of scrubbers etc.) In accounting for these costs, these businesses can have visibility to these costs and can better control them. Instead these costs are borne by the public who are at a disadvantage to control them (because they're not producing them).

We are at a historic point. Will we go down in history as being part of the solution ... or part of the problem? Will we take all of our human ingenuity and bravely stand to protect our health (that no amount of money can buy)? Will we look into our children's and loved one's eyes in 30 years and say that when we had the opportunity to make a difference, we took it? Or, will we forever be haunted by a missed opportunity and the terrible realization that we contributed to the poisoning of our selves and our loved ones?

Personally, I'm rising to the occasion. As a resident, I'm signed up for Blue Sky. As an employee, I motivated my business unit and two

others in my company to sign up for Blue Sky (and all together we account for one of the largest purchases of Blue Sky in Utah). I also motivated my business unit to take advantage of FinAnswer Express.

I encourage Rocky Mountain Power to join me ... more renewables, less coal. Help me make a happy history and not a regrettable future.

Sincerely,
Eleanor Tara Kelly

From: "Pippa Keene" <keene@utahhumanities.org>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 10:54:41 AM
Subject: Re: Coal Plant No vote

Utah Public Service Commission:

As a concerned Utah resident, I would like to voice my opinion about the proposed expansions of 3 Utah coal plants. I am opposed to investing resources into methods that will continue to pollute our skies with millions of additional tons of CO₂. I would fully support Rocky Mountain Power making a larger investment in renewable energy and other energy efficient measures. I support the Blue Skies wind power initiative and have been a subscriber for several years, enough to see the cost of this service decrease.

I urge you to think of the health of our state and the welfare of those living here and make Rocky Mountain Power responsible for improving our environment.

Thank you,

Pippa Keene

Pippa Keene

Utah Humanities Council Motherhead/Fatheread Program

801.359.9670

From: "Erika Brown" <erikabrown1@gmail.com>
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 10/13/2006 10:04:15 AM
Subject: comments on proposed power plants in Utah

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed coal plants for Utah. I strongly urge the consideration of other sources of energy due to the detrimental health and environmental impacts of coal mining and burning. I prefer my tax dollars to go toward cleaner energy more efficient energy sources. Please consider my view as a voting taxpayer. I appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Erika