

# Comment #22-035-35

1 message

Yoram Bauman <yoram@standupeconomist.com>
To: psc@utah.gov

Wed, Aug 17, 2022 at 6:33 AM

To the PSC: I am an economist (PhD, University of Washington, 2003) who specializes in environmental economics and public finance. The economic theory of market failures relating to externalities is well known and agreed on by economics across the political spectrum. Almost all economists also agree that the best solution is to internalize the externality by using prices or other surrogates for missing market signals. These prices can be actual prices (as with a carbon tax) or "shadow prices" that are used in models and other planning work.

I urge the PSC to incorporate solid economic thinking about externalities into its resource planning work.

Sincerely, Yoram Bauman PhD 825 E Logan Ave SLC UT 84015



# **Clean Energy**

1 message

**jerry h** <jhamik2000@yahoo.com> To: psc@utah.gov Tue, Aug 16, 2022 at 8:14 PM

Be responsible and help the environment! Sent from my iPhone



### IRP comment

1 message

**Susan Watson** <swatsonarnp@gmail.com> To: psc@utah.gov Wed, Aug 17, 2022 at 7:00 AM

it is critical that Pacificorp be responsible for the damage to the environment and be responsible for the environmental and societal externality costs that should be specifically identified and assessed by a neutral third party, not PacifiCorp;

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.

I am requesting PSC action, PacifiCorp/RMP will have to disclose and explain how it has been calculating externalities; and justify why so many real-world costs have been ignored or minimized.



## Comment, 22-035-35

1 message

Janiece Pompa <pompa\_j@ed.utah.edu>
To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Wed, Aug 17, 2022 at 2:48 PM

Hello -

I believe that at present, the Utah Public Service Commission needs to review and update its Integrated Resource Plan 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.

I would also like to know how the PSC has been calculating externalities, as well as a justification regarding why so many real-world costs have been ignored or minimized. How does PacificCorp manage to ignore the environmental and societal damages it causes by burning coal and 'natural' gas to generate 85% of its electricity in Utah?

These things I would like to know.

Janiece L. Pompa, Ph.D.

Director, University of Utah Educational

Assessment and Student Support Clinic

Dept. of Educational Psychology

1721 Campus Center Dr. (SAEC), Rm. 3223

Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Office: 801-587-1716

Fax: 801-581-5566

"Never let your sense of morals prevent you from doing what is right."

Isaac Asimov

This message may contain Protected Healthcare Information (PHI) that is considered confidential under the Privacy Act, 5 USC 552(a) and/or the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any unauthorized use, disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this correspondence in error, please notify the sender at once by replying to this email and destroy any copies you have made or received.