

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	3/22/2019
*Name: Kate Bowman	Title: Renewable Energy Program Manager	
*E-mail: kate@utahcleanenergy.org	Phone: (801) 903-2031	
*Organization: Utah Clean Energy		
Address: 1014 East Second Avenue		
City: Salt Lake City	State: UT	Zip: 84105

Public Meeting Date comments address: [Click here to enter date.](#) Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting: Navigant

***IRP Topic(s) and/or Agenda Items:** List the specific topics that are being addressed in your comments.
Navigant 2018 Private Generation Long-Term Resource Assessment (2019 - 2038)

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.

Navigant's 2018 Private Generation Long-Term Resource Assesment provides base, low, and high forecasts for solar adoption in PacifiCorp's six states. In the case of Utah, the "base" and "high" case forecasts are identical in 2019 and 2020, and in 2019 both the "base" and "high" case appear to forecast lower levels of solar adoption than the "low" case. Please explain the modeling output and rationale for (1) a "base" and "high" case that are identical in the first two years of the forecast, and (2) a "low" case that is higher than the "base" and "high" case in the first year of the forecast.

Additionally, the supporting tables contain several numbers that appear to be negative. For example, see Table 28, Residential PV in 2026 (-4264 MWh) and Table 30, Residential PV in 2026 (-3473 MWh). Please explain the rationale for negative numbers in the output of this forecast, or, if the negative numbers are a typo, whether this error impacted any of the modeling or conclusions from this analysis.

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

* Required fields

Thank you for participating.

* Required fields