

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 9/12/2016

*Name: Joni Zenger

Title: **Technical Consultant**

*E-mail: jzenger@utah.gov

Phone: (801) 530-6787

*Organization: Utah Division of Public Utilities

Address: 160 E. 300 South

City: **Salt Lake City**

State: **UT**

Zip: **84111**

Public Meeting Date comments address: **8/25/2026**

Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting:

**Bob Davis, Artie Powell, Jeff Einfeldt, Abdinasir Abdulle,
Brenda Salter, Justin Christensen, Chuck Peterson**

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

Portfolio development, sensitivity studies, Volume III analysis, process improvements, supply side resources, outside studies, load forecast, other

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.

Silence on any topic does not mean the Division agrees or disagrees with the Company or other stakeholders in this IRP process, and the Division may provide comments at a later date.

Portfolio Development

The Division supports developing a diverse set of resource portfolios and additional stochastic analysis. The Division also supports the Company's goal of managing the total number of core cases in order to complete the risk analysis and sensitivity studies. The Division recognizes that the 2017 portfolio development is difficult, especially with the Clean Power Plan on hold with the courts. There is a fine line between developing a set of diverse core portfolios and hard wiring the IRP models or letting the models select the preferred portfolio, which has been a criticism of the IRP in the past.

With respect to the change in portfolio development that includes the Regional Haze outcomes before running the System Optimizer, the Division appreciates that the Company provided an opportunity for public input and information exchange on this topic.

Sensitivity Studies

* Required fields

The Division is awaiting a Commission order on the Company's Business Plan sensitivity that is based on the first three years of portfolio resources where the remaining years of resources are optimized. However, its recommendation to the Commission supports this approach.

The Division agrees that a cap on front office transactions is the sensitivity study is warranted.

Volume III Analysis

The Division requests a written explanation of the term "endogenous retirement." What is the retirement endogenous to—the Company, the model, etc.?

With the Company's announcement that it has decided to retire the Craig Station Unit 1 plant in 2025 rather than installing emissions controls by 2021, the Division appreciates the Company's willingness to provide an analysis that supports this decision in the 2017 IRP. Although this analysis will be helpful in the 2017 IRP, the Division believes that approval by the Utah Commission of this decision may be required. Given that an IRP is only acknowledged and the Craig decision is one issue among many, the Division does not believe acknowledgement of the 2017 IRP is sufficient, and is not the forum, for approval of the Craig Station 1 decision or a determination of the prudence of the costs in that decision. The Division has informally communicated this position to the Rocky Mountain Power regulatory team and understands that RMP is considering the matter possibly seeking approval through a depreciation case, general rate case, or an alternative appropriate procedure.

Process Improvements

The Company has requested comments be as specific as possible. Therefore, the Division notes that the meeting was facilitated well, the sound was improved, and it worked well when Shay controlled the outside callers so they could not put the phone on hold while the meeting participants listened to music. This is the recommended approach for future meetings. The Company ensured that all required personnel and consultants were present or on the phone line. This is a notable improvement from distant IRPs. The Company has done an excellent job in responding to past feedback and in allowing public input at the meetings. Shay and Rick work well together and the Division appreciates having at least one of the Oregon staff attend in person at the Utah stakeholder meetings. This is responsive to the Division's past comments and is an improvement from distant IRPs.

With respect to the Company's request that feedback be as specific as possible, the Division does not want to come across as "nitpicky," as it appreciates the Company's willingness and openness to solicit feedback from public stakeholders in a product that is in the end the Company's IRP. The Division did not have the opportunity to review the meeting materials that were sent the day before the meeting at 2:00 p.m. With meetings scheduled that afternoon, most staff didn't see the slides until shortly before the meeting, which was not sufficient time (especially for the technical slides). Also, the studies themselves were not posted on PacifiCorp's IRP webpage prior to the meeting, but the Division saw that they were posted upon returning to the office.

The Division requests that the Company not schedule future IRP meetings on the same dates as CAISO regional integration meetings. Division staff covering the IRP also cover the CAISO.

The Division thanks the Company for allocating time on Friday to review the RPS request for proposals that the Division was unable to hear at the last meeting.

Supply Side Resources

The discussion was thorough and the presentation of example plants was useful, especially seeing pictures of the resources. The pictures showing the various sizes of rotors, turbines, and manufacturers were excellent. Please continue providing the pictures. It really helps non-engineers visualize the resources. The Company went through 50 slides at a rapid pace, and it would improve the process if stakeholders had more time to look at each slide. The Thursday agenda

* Required fields

was full, but on Friday, the meeting concluded early. On day one, the Company went through 106 slides (that did not include the two technical studies). On day two, the Company presented 42 slides. The pace at day one was too fast. The meeting could have been improved had the two days' agendas been more balanced in order to spend more time looking at the supply side slides.

Outside Studies

The Division echoes the same comments above. The Private Generation and Energy Storage slides were presented too quickly to digest and the Division wishes the consultants had presented the slides. Unfortunately, in the late afternoon section of the day one meeting, the Private Generation and Energy Storage discussion moved so quickly that it was difficult to digest the slides as quickly as the Company went through them.

The Division recognizes and thanks the Company for having the consultants who performed the studies available at the meeting to answer questions. However, the Company presented the consultants' analyses and it would have been preferable to have the consultants themselves present their findings, especially since they were on the conference line. The Division is currently reviewing both studies and will comment further once it has an opportunity to study them.

Load Forecast

The Division, as well as others in attendance at the August 26 meeting, notes that Slide 144 is incorrect. Please provide the July Peak Producing Weather slide with the proper data.

Please provide the WECC resource adequacy evaluation, which is a supplemental study used in the 2017 IRP, as it becomes available.

Referring to the Navigant report, how much will the Company reduce each state's load forecast?

Other

Please provide all pdf charts and graphs presented at IRP stakeholder meetings in their original Excel format. Please provide these at the time when the Company posts the meeting materials that contain the data.

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.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Thank you for participating.