

PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2019 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 2019 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 10/17/2018

*Name: Thomas Familia

Title: Sr. Renewable Analyst

*E-mail: thomasfamilia@state.or.us

Phone: 503-551-0531

*Organization: Oregon Public Utility Commission

Address: 201 High Street Suite 100

City: Salem

State: Oregon

Zip: 97301

Public Meeting Date comments address: 9/27/2018

Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

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

Transmission Overview and Updates

Check here if any of the following information being submitted is copyrighted or confidential.

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.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Staff (Staff) appreciates PacifiCorp's presentation and information relating to the Transmission Overview and Updates presentation provided at the 2019 IRP Public Meeting held on Sept. 27-28, 2018. Staff offers the following comment requesting further clarity and additional information so as to more meaningfully participate in this process.

PacifiCorp's most recent statement that multiple segments of Energy Gateway may never be needed, even beyond 2024, is surprising to Staff. The Company explained that new line construction is generally spurred by NERC reliability concerns, load growth, or a Transmission Service Request/Agreement in OASIS. To ensure that Staff has the most recent information on the company's planning, we request an explanation of how reliability, load growth, and transmission service requests are influencing the outstanding segments of Energy Gateway.

The Company should explain why a B2H in-service date has been moved to 2025 from 2026. Further, the Company has not identified a need for B2H in its IRP. Beyond an update of the project sponsor's role and resource need, the Company has not presented a clear case for why B2H is needed but other segments of Energy Gateway are not. The Company should identify the role of B2H as a need or component in its least-cost/least-risk portfolio and why it intends on moving forward with the project. The Company should also explain the size and status of any B2H transmission service requests have been submitted to PacifiCorp.

* Required fields

In the last IRP meeting, the Company identified new transmission modeling “enhancements.” Staff requests more information on this modeling:

- a. The Company stated the model would have a dozen possible transmission upgrades. Staff requests information on the cost and size of the upgrades.
- b. WUTC Staff noted at the meeting that these assumptions would be based on a power flow model, and Staff request more information on a power flow model used.
- c. Staff requests information about whether PacifiCorp will incorporate power flow patterns in this analysis, whether these enhancements consider engineering patterns or not in selecting portfolios, and base assumptions about existing transmission data.
- d. Staff requests more information about whether B2H is included in the list of upgrades. Staff also requests more information about how B2H upgrade costs have been considered in past IRPs.
- e. Staff requests more explanation about how current available transmission is considered. For example, the supply side resource table now lists five different locations for proxy solar, and the Company indicated that these are five locations where transmission is available. Staff requests more information about where transmission is available, where upgrades would be required, and how current ATC versus required upgrades may be valued in IRP modeling.

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.](#)

Please submit your completed Stakeholder Feedback Form via email to IRP@PacifiCorp.com

Thank you for participating.

* Required fields