

"Comment, Docket 22-035-35"

1 message

menziesrm@aol.com <menziesrm@aol.com> Reply-To: menziesrm@aol.com To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov> Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 6:43 PM

Having worked all my career for large corporations I am a great believer in the power of the capitalist system. However, this system only works if the cost of a commodity, product or service reflects all the true costs. Having society bear the many costs of the externalities of generating power by burning fossil fuels creates a huge distortion in such pricing. I urge the PSC to have the externalities calculated by an independent 3rd party and not rely on internal estimates from PacifiCorp.

Sincerely,

Richard Menzies



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

H B Stuart <hollybstuart@gmail.com>
To: psc@utah.gov

Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 8:38 PM

The PSC must update its IRP guidelines so that:

- all environmental and societal externality costs are specifically identified and assessed by a neutral third party, not PacifiCorp;
- all IRP resource models and portfolios acknowledge the full range of monetized externality costs; and,
- every biennial IRP process will include a technical review of the latest externalities research.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Holly Stuart 426 South Elizabeth Street Salt Lake City UT 84102



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

dcortsen@comcast.net <dcortsen@comcast.net>
To: psc@utah.gov

Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 9:35 PM

Greetings,

I believe that the IRP guidelines offer unfair advantage to the utility and allow them to take excess profits that are subsidized by taxpayers like me. For example:

Rocky Mountain Power generates a high percentage of its electricity by burning coal because it offers them cost savings and return on prior investment. Burning coal for power generation produces CO2 which contributes to climate change. With climate change we have seen the average temperatures rise in summer months. This causes us to run the air conditioning more, thus purchasing more electricity from Rocky Mountain power.

- This is a direct conflict of interest since their savings produce a public cost that in turn benefits them.
- Given conflict and potential bias it seems likely they are not held responsible for the costs incurred for the pollutants they disperse.
- It is also likely that the cost of public loss and public response to weather and climate related issues such as increased forest fires and damaging storms is not fairly and accurately considered.

We need externalities to be a rigorous part of the IRP process and for those externalities to be evaluated by an independent third party.

Concerns over rate inflation have been mitigated over the past few years through reduced cost of renewables and alternate energy sources. At the same time we have seen societal costs of overweighting the rate concerns relative to environmental cost concerns as the environmental and societal cost is skyrocketing. It is beyond time to adjust the balance.

Regards,

Daniel N. Cortsen

351 E. 8920 S.

Sandy, UT 84070



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

Gretchen Semerad <semerad7@yahoo.com> To: psc@utah.gov Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 9:47 PM

Hi,

I am submitting a comment on Docket 22-035-35. I am an owner of a rooftop solar system for my home and believe in trying to reduce my carbon emissions as much as possible. I also believe our utility providers should be quickly moving toward renewable energy and paying the full cost for any carbon emissions they are a part of.

The Utah Public Service Commission should update its Integrated Resource Plan guidelines so that:

- 1. All environmental and societal externality costs are specifically identified and assessed by a *neutral* third party, not PacfiCorp.
- 2. All Integrated Resource Plan resource models and portfolios acknowledge the full range of monetized externality costs
- 3. Every biennial Integrated Resource Plan process will include a technical review of the latest externalities research

The Integrated Resource Plan guideline for dealing with externalities is 30 years old and allows PacifiCorp to identify the externalities to be considered in its own Integrated Resource Plan. This permits PacifiCorp to escape a full consideration of externalities and not assess the true cost of burning fossil fuels. Based on internationally accepted science, we need to make progress on climate change issues as soon as possible. Updating the Integrated Resource Plan guidelines as discussed above would be an important local step.

Thank you, Gretchen 1533 Kings Row Dr SLC, UT



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

Christopher Davis <cdav88@gmail.com> To: psc@utah.gov Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 10:38 PM

To whom it may Concern,

As a Utah resident, I am outraged at the PacificCorp's Integrated Resource Pan. The lack of any sort of plan to pay for external damage caused by its reckless burning of fossil fuels is something that the paying taxpayer cannot ignore. Please force the new plan to require a third party to define and examine all societal and environmental externalities that are caused by PacifiCorp's business. They should have to include in their portfolio these externalities and their costs (that are determined by a third party). These should have to be readdressed and updated biannually as well!

A concerned citizen and avid voter, Christopher Davis 190 Saint Moritz Strasse Park City, UT 84098

Sent from my iPhone



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

Monica Kohler <2monicakohler@gmail.com>
To: psc@utah.gov

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 7:52 AM

Cc: ucare@xmission.com

Dear PSC,

My concern on the current IRP process for RMP/Pacificorp centers around the similarity to Enron and Arthur Andersen, where there is not enough oversight during the review process. Given the nature of the information and its relationship to financial planning, it seems that having an external auditing and evaluation process would be more effective than having a forensic accounting of what went disastrously wrong after a major problem.

Working at the University of Utah, and as a tax-payer and a donor, I welcome the state auditors having an on-going auditing relationship with the University in order to address problems as they arise and as methods, policies and information create the need for responsive change. Any organization that solely relies on internal auditing of policies, procedures and finances will inevitably end up in the same quandary as Enron and Arthur Andersen, and for the same reasons.

I agree with the Utah Citizens Advocating Renewable Energy estimation that the best way to evaluate the ability for RMP/Pacificorp to be able to deal with the costs associated with climate change is to update its guidelines so that:

- ~ all environmental and societal externality costs are specifically identified and assessed by a neutral third party, not PacifiCorp;
- ~ all IRP resource models and portfolios acknowledge the full range of monetized externality costs; and,
- ~ every biennial IRP process will include a technical review of the latest externalities research.

Thank you, Monica Kohler



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

Karma Wayman <kwayma15@gmail.com> To: psc@utah.gov Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 9:43 AM

It's time to take guidelines into the 21st Century.

The PSC needs to update its IRP guidelines so that:

- ~ all environmental and societal externality costs are specifically identified and assessed by a neutral third party, not PacifiCorp;
- ~ all IRP resource models and portfolios acknowledge the full range of monetized externality costs; and,
- ~ every biennial IRP process will include a technical review of the latest externalities research.

PacifiCorp's 2021 Integrated Resource Plan is flawed and ignores the extensive environmental and societal damages it causes by burning fossil fuels to generate 85% of its electricity in Utah. This is so outdated.



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

David Folland <dsfolland@gmail.com>
To: psc@utah.gov

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 10:31 AM

Dear PSC members,

I'm writing to ask you to update the IRP guidelines to reflect the current realities of our environment and our communities. Specifically, the IRP guidelines should reflect the true costs to our communities, including the externalities of the energy sources the power company chooses. To accurately evaluate these externalities, a neutral third party should identify and assess them and not leave this responsibility solely to Rocky Mountain Power.

30 years ago, when the current guidelines for dealing with externalities were created, the extent of externalities of burning fossil fuels was not as evident. Now these externalities are staring us in the face: historic drought; historic shrinking of the Great Salt Lake; record heat; decreasing snowpack; increased summer air pollution from wildfires; recognition of illness and death from air pollution. These externalities should be calculated in the cost of the energy sources that are chosen by the power company, and incorporated into all models and portfolios. In addition, biennial reviews should take in the latest research on externalities.

Thank you for considering my opinion as you update the IRB guidelines.

Best Regards,

David Folland

David S Folland, MD
Citizens' Climate Lobby Volunteer
8810 Sheffield Way
Sandy, UT 84093
(m)801-891-7152
"Spread kindness, not the virus." Dr. Bob Peterson



Comment, Docket 22-035-35

1 message

C Clark <saveearth27@yahoo.com>
To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 1:44 PM

PacificCorp needs to update its IRP guidelines to reflect environmental realities.

Reviews need to adequately identify social and environmental costs. This must be done by a neutral 3rd party. It must include updated research and definitions.

We need to stay on top of environmental degradation or it will get the better of us.

C Clark Salt Lake City 84103