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.

\boxtimes Yes \square No	May we post these comments to the IRP webpage?		Date of Submittal	9/22/2016
*Name:	John Crider OPUC	Title:	Staff	
*E-mail:	John.crider@state.or.us	Phone:	Click here to enter te	ext.
*Organization:	OPUC			
Address:	Click here to enter text.			
City:	Click here to enter text. State: Click	ck here to e	nter text. Zip: C	lick here to enter text.
Public Mee	ting Date comments address: Click here to enter date.		theck here if not related	l to specific meeting
List additional orga	anization attendees at cited meeting: Click here	e to enter to	ext.	
Regional Haze an	nd/or Agenda Items: List the specific topics that and Coal Retirements		•	
☐ Check he	ere if any of the following information being submitt	ted is copy	righted or confident	ial.
Staff shares the contrue bookends real RH compliance strassertion that a strassertion	comment: Please provide your feedback for each IRP concern of other stakeholders in being assured that garding cost and risk. Specifically, the Commission of crategies including early retirement of units (i.e., interategy of early retirement (possibly earlier than recommission expects quantitative analysis that supparaios the annualized cost of new wind resources could plants. This of course leads to the question of we cost portfolio than the proposed portfolios. Again, led portfolio, the Commission expects the Company thousands.	the choice expects the certempo equired by ports that buld be leave to provide to provide	e of portfolios to be a le Company to exami ral solutions). If it is to SIP/FIP) is not prefer assertion. One stake ast-cost compared to arlier-than-required re anowledging the Come e PVRR analysis in ord	ine the full breadth of the Company's rred because of higher eholder has asserted run-rate capital retirements might apany's IRP Action der to compare the
	st from EIA is more appropriate). If electronic attac names here.		-	
Recommendatio Click here to enter	ons: Provide any additional recommendations if not itext.	included a	bove - specificity is	greatly appreciated.
Thank you for pa	rticipating.			

^{*} Required fields