

PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2021 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 2021 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 2/10/2020

*Name: Nikita Bankoti

Title: **Regulatory Analyst**

*E-mail: Nikita.bankoti@utc.wa.gov

Phone: 360-664-1251

*Organization: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

Address: 621 Woodland Square Loop S.E.

City: **Lacey** State: **WA** Zip: **98503**

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: [Click here to enter text.](#)

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

PacifiCorp 2021 Conservation Potential Assessment Draft Work Plan

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.

Please see the attached comments on Page 2

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@Pacifcorp.com

Thank you for participating.

* Required fields

- No master crosswalk provided that would otherwise enable the following review approaches to residential and/or non-residential measures lists:
 - **Total consolidated residential and commercial / industrial measure lists.** Measures within workbook tabs remain separated by source (e.g., NWPCC’s Power Plan, RTF).
 - *Are all of these measures actively being considered?*
 - *Or is AEG / Pac simply illustrating the sources from which they are pulling measures?*

PacifiCorp Response:

The intent of these “crosswalk” spreadsheets is to confirm that measures from jurisdictionally relevant Northwest Power and Conservation Council analyses are properly incorporated into the Conservation Potential Assessment (CPA) and that the Washington biennium energy efficiency (EE) target is in alignment as appropriate. The source measures are presented on the left half of these tables and the corresponding CPA measures on the right. Any row on these “crosswalks” that includes a Measure Code (e.g., “RM039”) is being recommended for inclusion within the CPA.

- **Measures grouped by Pac program option.** “PacifiCorp_2021_Draft_Measure_List_for_Review” PPT would provide a good approach for prioritizing review of measures that are either new for Pac’s 2021 CPA or significantly revised from Pac’s 2019 CPA. However, this “program” schema is not carried through either the residential nor non-residential measure Excel workbooks. The best attempt to indicate whether or not measures are new / significantly different is found within the “ET Tables” tab of the Non-residential draft measure list. However, Pac / AEG provides no indication as to whether this list is comprehensive (i.e., are all measures being considered for 2021 included within this tab?).
 - *Please add crosswalk tabs to both Excel workbooks that would enable stakeholders to review measures by Pac Power program option.*

PacifiCorp Response:

Applied Energy Group (AEG) will conduct this analysis during the measure characterization process. However, AEG reviewed PacifiCorp programs as part of past CPA efforts and ensured that existing measures are represented within the list. The list of measures considered for inclusion is housed in the “SECTOR-Equip” and “SECTOR-Meas” spreadsheets within each workbook. The other spreadsheets were included to provide context surrounding this list.

- **Measure workbooks are password protected.** The inability to save a local copy of the Excel measure workbooks limits stakeholders’ abilities to perform independent QA/QC, the results of which could help Pac / AEG with their subsequent measure list revisions.
 - *Please provide Excel file passwords enabling greater stakeholder QA/QC ability*

PacifiCorp Response:

PacifiCorp has removed the password protection on the measure list Excel file.

- **Lack of quantitative savings reported by measure.** Existing workbooks provide only qualitative measure descriptions. Onus is on stakeholder to crosswalk Pac workbooks against independent organizations’ data files (if they exist).
 - *Please provide summary quantitative savings values by measure (e.g., annual UES in kWh) to provide stakeholders a better sense of the rough order of magnitude (ROM) savings by measure.*

PacifiCorp Response:

The intent of the measure list review is to provide stakeholders with an opportunity early in the process to provide input on the list of demand-side management measures that will ultimately be considered in the CPA. Since this is presented before measure characterization work has been conducted, AEG is unable to provide quantitative values. These assumptions will be shared with stakeholders during the June 18-19,

2020 public input meeting. Providing quantitative impacts would require researching and characterizing the measures, which would delay delivery of this document to a point where stakeholder feedback could not be incorporated without jeopardizing timeline for the integrated resource plan.

- **Expanding the abbreviations such as XCEL, IL TRM.**

PacifiCorp Response:

These are detailed on the “Introduction” spreadsheet within each list. Xcel Energy is a large utility with service territory in Colorado, among other states. IL stands for Illinois, whose technical reference manual development process involves robust stakeholder engagement and is being considered as a source in the Utah and Wyoming analysis.