

June 30, 2016

My name is Eugenia Marks. I reside at 11 Methyl Street, Providence, Rhode Island. I hold a Masters degree in Environmental Studies from Brown University. I worked for 35 years for Audubon Society of Rhode Island, the last 20 of which as Senior Director for Policy.

I understand that this hearing is on need and cost.

I ask that the Commission consider costs other than direct financial costs. Contingency costs that may be experienced as financial costs are the increases to atmospheric carbon and the consequent predicted more intense storms leading to flooding and erosion throughout Rhode Island. The increase in deposition of carbon into the atmosphere, has a world-wide effect, and cannot be viewed as a direct cause and effect to Rhode Island.

Flooding may cause costs of property damage or loss and may contribute to public infrastructure loss or damage. Coastal flooding, as indicated by many reports from CRMC and the Coastal Institute at URI, is a threat to both commerce and highways.

Increased temperatures, which have been shown to be correlated to increased carbon, cause cities to become heat sinks, with not only costs of health consequences, but greater energy demand for cooling.

The opportunity cost of permitting a fossil-fuel plant rather than waiting to permit a non-fossil energy plant should also be considered. My reading of public documents indicates that the energy is not needed currently and the need in the foreseeable future is uncertain. So the opportunity balances on the side of non-carbon produced energy that would benefit not only with electricity but also with greater protection from the consequences. *Hydropower can supply base energy when solar and wind do not produce.*

I ask the Commission to consider the opportunity costs of using drinking quality water to cool the plant. I understand that the proposal is for closed cooling. Nonetheless water is lost to evaporation and needs to be replaced, and furthermore, the application indicates that under the option to burn oil, much more water from the aquifer, even though through the water supplier, the source is groundwater. I understand surficial geology. I know that in the Clear/Branch River basin, there is limited depth to bedrock where sand and gravel hold groundwater. As a matter of fact, the gasoline leak that rendered the Pascoag Water Utility unable to supply residents, occurred through a fissure in bedrock, showing the shallowness and the inter-relatedness of bedrock to aquifer in this area. There is also the cost of threatening further development in Burrillville, under the oil option, because available water will be used by the proposed Invenergy plant.

The alternative use of Wallum Lake for supply also calls for an investigation of environmental costs, given the recreational use and bi-state (with Massachusetts) geography of that body of water.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

RECEIVED BY []
FULL (DATE) []
IDENT (DATE) []
EXHIBIT NO. []
SPONSOR []

June 30, 2016

PUC Public Hearing

Invenergy Docket #4609

Dear Commissioner DeSimone,

At a time when climate change is becoming more evident and the world is moving towards energy independence and renewables, it is evident that allowing Invenergy to build a 1,000 mw fracked- gas power plant in Burrillville, RI would be a huge mistake.

Recently, I've done a lot of research on the matter of energy production and power plants. It has been stated that although Invenergy claims that there is a need to build this power plant, the reality is that the energy they sold in the ISO's Forward Capacity Auction in February 2016 is in excess of what is needed in the ISO's requirements. The ISO needed to clear 10,028 MW in the southeastern New England region. Invenergy sold less than half, 485 MW, of its proposed 1,000 MW in the latest auction. FCA – 10 secured 11,384 MW in the SENE zone. How can Invenergy claim their power plant is needed??

They claim to be replacing older coal burning facilities with this power plant. However a fracked gas and diesel oil burning facility is not any better than coal. From energy justice website- "After approximately 400 new gas-burning power plants were built since the late 1990's, there is now 37% more natural gas electric generating capacity than coal. However, more than half of that capacity is not used." "Natural gas burning power plants are a major source of air pollution. A 1,000 MW gas plant can legally release over 3 million pounds of regulated air pollutants a year." I say no thank you!!

The only need apparent to me is the need of big corporations to make a boatload of money as fast as they can, before everyone wakes up and finally puts a stop to this horrible practice of making money at the expense of our beautiful country. ^f→

We are looking for real clean energy solutions and we conserve every day. It would be a shame to lose such valued forested wildlife area when it can easily be avoided, We are not in an energy shortage and it doesn't appear that we would be anytime soon. Please save our town and advise the EFSB to not site Invenergy's proposed power plant. We have nothing to gain from them but a whole lot to lose.

Sincerely,

Lynn Clark

370 Wallum Lake Rd.

Pascoag, RI 02859

PUBLIC UTILITIES	
COMMISSION	
DOCKET NO.	<u>4609</u>
SPONSOR	<u>Public</u>
EXHIBIT NO.	<u>7</u>
IDENT. (DATE)	<u>6/30/16</u>
FULL (DATE)	<u> </u>
RECEIVED BY	<u>cgw</u>