

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 7/11/2019

*Name: Rose Anderson

Title: Utility Analyst

*E-mail: Rose.anderson@state.or.us

Phone: 503.378.8718

*Organization: Oregon Public Utility Commission

Address: Click here to enter text.

City: Click here to enter text. State: Click here to enter text. Zip: Click here to enter text.

Public Meeting Date comments address: 4/25/2022 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.

Coal and reliability modeling

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.

1.

See slide 5 of the April Public Input Meeting slides. OPUC has questions regarding the 1,425 MW cap on FOTs:

-What would be the cost implications of relaxing the 1,425 MW cap to a 1,435 MW cap (10 MW increase in cap).

-What is the dollar amount of the change in revenue requirement from relaxing the cap by 10 MW?

-Does this dollar amount vary by area (division) and, if so, how and why?

-Staff believes the answers to these questions would help inform a discussion of the value of FOTs in the IRP.

Would PacifiCorp consider providing the above analysis as a sensitivity to the preferred portfolio in the 2019 IRP?

2.

See slide 40 of the April Public Input Meeting slides. Regarding the statement "Given aforementioned risk factors, 500 MW of capacity in excess...was required." Can PacifiCorp please provide an explanation of how the 500 MW was determined?

3.

See slide 36 of the April Public Input Meeting slides. Regarding the statement on deterministic studies' assumption of "Average market prices without electric or natural gas price volatility and physical supply risks" and the 500 MW excess capacity requirement on slide 40, does this sentence mean that PAC is modeling

* Required fields

physical supply risks, or not? If not, how does the 500 MW result change if there are NO assumed physical supply risks?

4.

See slide 40 of the April Public Input Meeting slides. Regarding the statement “Allocated between East and West based on peak load by season,” why allocate based on “peak load by season” and not on area shortfalls by season? Or, is this what Examples 1 and 2 imply, that the allocation is based on relative shortfall(s) by season?

5.

See slide 40 of the April 2019 Public Input Meeting, “Other resource types are locked at levels in pre-reliability portfolio.” At these locked levels, are any existing thermal plants generating at less than capacity? In other words, do the locked levels include any “throttled-back” thermal plants? If so, by how much are such plants “throttled-back” in the aggregate? Why did PAC choose to lock only those resources and not others?

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.

http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Integrated_Resource_Plan/2019_IRP/PacificCorp_2019_IRP_April_25_2019_PIM.pdf

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

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

Thank you for participating.