PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2017 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 2017 IRP, including, but not limited to the process, assumptions, and analysis. In providing your feedback, PacifiCorp requests that the stakeholders identify whether they are okay with the Company posting their comments on the IRP website.

⊠Yes □No	May we post these comments to the IRP webpage?				Date of Submittal	8/31/2016		
*Name:	Mitalee Gupta				Title:	Program and Po	olicy Associate	
*E-mail:	mgupta@utahcleanenerg	y.org			Phone:	801-363-4046		
*Organization:	Utah Clean Energy							
Address:	1014 2nd Avenue							
City:	Salt Lake City		State:	UT		Zip:	84103	
Public Mee	ting Date comments address:	8/26/2026			□ C	heck here if not rela	ated to specific meeting	
List additional organization attendees at cited meeting: Click here				to enter te	xt.			
*IRP Topic(s) and/or Agenda Items: List the specific topics that are being addressed in your comments. Utah Clean Energy requests more information from PacifiCorp on the following three areas:								
 Rate Design assumptions for the two new Class 3 DSM Residential options that have been included in the 2017 Conservation Potential Assessment Assumptions around the deployment of Advanced Metering Infrastructure for Class 3 DSM resources Opportunity for parties to provide feedback on the Conservation Potential Assessment before it is finalized 								
\Box Check here if any of the following information being submitted is copyrighted or confidential.								
*Respondent Comment: Please provide your feedback for each IRP topic listed above.								

1. Rate Design assumptions for the new Class 3 DSM Residential options that have been included in the 2017 **Conservation Potential Assessment**

Utah Clean Energy requests more information from PacifiCorp on specific Class 3 DSM Residential options that are new to the 2017 Conservation Potential Assessment. We understand that the study hasn't been finalized yet and preliminary results from the Conservation Potential Assessment were shared during the August 25-26, 2016 Public Input Meeting. Slide 121 of the public input meeting presentation shows both Time-of-Use (TOU) Demand Rate and Time-of-Use Demand Rate with Electric Vehicle as residential resource options that have been added to the 2017 study. We request information on proposed rate design assumptions and resources that were used by the Company in the development of these TOU Demand Rate and TOU Demand Rate with Electric Vehicle.

2. Assumptions around the deployment of Advanced Metering Infrastructure for Class 3 DSM

Utah Clean Energy and Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, in their joint comments in the Docket No. 15-35-04 on the DSM Potential Study from the 2015 IRP, recommended the Company to consider an early deployment of Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) given the tremendous potential of Class 3 DSM resources. The 2015 Potential Study assumed AMI deployment to begin from 2019. We request PacifiCorp to provide information on the assumptions relating to the AMI deployment timeline in the 2017 Assessement.

3. Opportunity for parties to provide feedback on the Conservation Potential Assessment before it is finalized

At the Public Input Meeting on August 25-26, 2016 only preliminary results from the Conservation Potential Assessment were shared. As PacifiCorp works on finalizing this study, we and SWEEP request the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft study. We would appreciate if the Company could share the draft version of the overall study and invite feedback before it is finalized and published.

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.

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

We request the company to provide additional information on the Class 3 DSM resource options, AMI deployment timeline and also share the draft Conservation Potential Assessment with the parties to solicit feedback.

Thank you for participating.