

# PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

## 2023 Integrated Resource Plan

PacifiCorp (the Company) requests that stakeholders provide feedback to the Company upon the conclusion of each public input meeting and/or stakeholder conference calls, as scheduled. PacifiCorp values the input of its active and engaged stakeholder group, and stakeholder feedback is critical to the IRP public input process. PacifiCorp requests that stakeholders provide comments using this form, which will allow the Company to more easily review and summarize comments by topic and to readily identify specific recommendations, if any, being provided. Information collected will be used to better inform issues included in the 2023 IRP, including, but not limited to the process, assumptions, and analysis. In order to maintain open communication and provide the broader Stakeholder community with useful information, the Company will generally post all appropriate feedback on the IRP website unless you request otherwise, below.

Date of Submittal 2023-05-16

\*Name: Donald Hendrickson

Title:

\*E-mail: dhendrickson@energystrat.com

Phone: 8016521292

\*Organization: Utah Association of Energy Users

Address: 111 E Broadway Suite 1200

City: SLC

State: UT

Zip: 84111

Public Meeting Date comments address:

Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting:

**\*IRP Topic(s) and/or Agenda Items:** List the specific topics that are being addressed in your comments.

1) Understanding East/West Capacity additions relative to the Preferred Portfolio; 2) Calculation of Capital Cost Payment factor in Table 7.2

Check here if you do **not** want your Stakeholder feedback and accompanying materials posted to the IRP website.

**\*Respondent Comment:** Please provide your feedback for each IRP topic listed above.

1. Understanding East West Capacity additions and how they relate to the Preferred Portfolio a. The Preferred Portfolio lists storage resources separate from wind resources and solar resources, but Tables 9.21 and 9.22 have rows for wind and solar separately, wind plus storage, solar plus storage, and storage separately. Please provide the detail of what preferred portfolio resources were modeled as wind and solar separately, wind plus storage, solar plus storage, and storage separately. 2.

Please provide the methodology and workpapers for how the Capital Cost Payment Factors in Table 7.2 were calculated.

### **PacifiCorp Response (6/6/23):**

1. For all proxy, future, non-cluster study resources, the model was allowed to select any combination of resources at any location. In these time frames, all wind, solar, storage, non-emitting peaking, pumped hydro, gas etc. are considered standalone items. Any cluster study resources, or planned/acquired resources were modeled in the given configuration provided to PacifiCorp as part of the cluster study request or acquisition process (i.e. if a developer requested a study as a standalone solar resource, that cluster item was modeled as standalone, and if the request was solar coupled with battery storage it was modeled as such).

2. Please submit data requests as part of the post-filing docketed procedure.

**Data Support:** If applicable, provide any documents, hyper-links, etc. in support of comments. (i.e. gas forecast is too high - this forecast from EIA is more appropriate). If electronic attachments are provided with your comments, please list those attachment names here.

\* Required fields

---

**Recommendations:** Provide any additional recommendations if not included above - specificity is greatly appreciated.

---

Please submit your completed Stakeholder Feedback Form via email to [IRP@PacifiCorp.com](mailto:IRP@PacifiCorp.com)

Thank you for participating.

\* Required fields