



PublicService Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

---

**Public Comment to IRP Docket #25-035-22 - Natrium Cost Disclosures**

1 message

---

**Craig Wallentine** <mountainstate10@gmail.com>  
To: psc@utah.gov

Sat, Apr 5, 2025 at 9:44 AM

**Subject: Public Comment to IRP Docket #25-035-22**

Dear Commissioners:

As you know, sunlight is the best disinfectant. As a result, I was seriously concerned when I saw the following comment in the [Utility Dive article about the RMP Natrium plant](#):

"By the end of this year, PacifiCorp also plans to finalize a 500-MW agreement to buy electricity from TerraPower's Natrium advanced nuclear project in Wyoming, which is set to be operating by the end of 2031, the utility company said. **The cost of the project is confidential.**"

First, I hope you can tell ratepayers that the journalist was wrong. As you know, the Natrium plant is being built with over \$2 billion dollars of taxpayer guarantees. There is zero rationale for keeping the taxpayers in the dark. RMP should disclose the cost at least once a year especially if they are going to be contracting on behalf of Utah ratepayers.

Second, I am sure that you are fully aware of the UAMPS fiasco when they failed to regularly report the sharp cost increases in the NuScale project. Each time project cost information was shared with the municipalities involved, a large number dropped out.

Despite hardcore marketing efforts, no new municipalities could be recruited and the project was cancelled at the final cost review because it made no economic sense for Utah ratepayers. Annual disclosures would have prevented this slow motion debacle with more frequent public ratepayer input.

Third, there is hard evidence that [the existing \\$4 billion cost estimate for Natrium is seriously out of date](#). The technology has never been commercially demonstrated in the United States and has an unproven fuel supply chain. Natrium as a First-of-a-Kind (FOAK) project is going to be much less economical per MWe than proven AP1000 technology.

Please ensure that RMP issues regular cost updates on the Natrium project so that Utah ratepayers can watch the inevitable doubling in the claimed project cost over the next several IRP reporting periods.

I will close with the following quote from an MIT nuclear physicist who points out that there are much wiser ways to provide abundant clean firm power to Utahns than speculative small scale nuclear projects:

**“You can buy nuclear power that will give you a gigawatt of carbon free energy for \$10 billion or you can buy wind and solar that will give you four gigawatts of carbon free energy for \$10 billion,” Kemp said.”**

Thank you,

Craig Wallentine

Then you might do a simple intro to your short comment/question. Something like "I am concerned about, and wish to bring to your attention, the contents of a recent Utility Dive article at:

<https://www.utilitydive.com/news/pacificorp-2025-irp-resource-plan-wind-solar-coal/744195/>

- By the end of this year, PacifiCorp also plans to finalize a 500-MW agreement to buy electricity from TerraPower's Natrium advanced nuclear project in Wyoming, which is set to be operating by the end of 2031, the utility company said.
- **The cost of the project is confidential. [WHY?]**

I think that Rocky Mountain Power customers and Berkshire Hathaway shareholders have a right to know how much of their money the utility plans to spend on the Natrium project, as that money would then be unavailable for investment in other energy resources.