

# PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

## 2025 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 2025 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 2024-05-06

\*Name: Shannon Anderson

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

\*E-mail: sanderson@powderriverbasin.org

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

\*Organization: Powder River Basin Resource Council

Address: 934 N. Main St.

City: Sheridan

State: WY

Zip: 82801

Public Meeting Date comments address: 05-02-2024

Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting:

---

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

2023 IRP Update

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.

At the May 2, 2024 IRP meeting, PacifiCorp representatives stated that there is an "oral agreement" in place with TerraPower such that PacifiCorp customers will not be charged any costs related to the Natrium nuclear power plant. Please explain why the company feels an "oral agreement" is sufficient for this purpose and explain the details of such agreement - who made it? when was it made? was it further represented by any writing or more formal conditions or agreements between the parties? Please also explain what "costs" were included in the agreement - construction costs? initial fuel costs? testing and analysis costs? regulatory costs? or does it also include operating and maintenance costs once the Natrium plant is operational and serving customers? Please also explain if it is PacifiCorp's understanding that the Natrium nuclear power plant will serve PacifiCorp customers exclusively as is represented in the 2023 IRP and previous IRPs or whether TerraPower plans to operate it as a merchant plant that sells power to PacifiCorp but not exclusively? Please see the Inside Climate News Story linked below that says the power will serve California - is that statement made simply because of the EIM or because TerraPower plans to sell directly to customers in California?

---

**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.

<https://insideclimatenews.org/news/04052024/wyoming-terrapower-nuclear-plant/>

---

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

\* Required fields

PacifiCorp should identify new/amended action items for the 2025 IRP Action Plan to ensure protection of ratepayers from unjust costs and expenses associated with the Natrium Nuclear Power Plant.

---

**PacifiCorp Response 5/8/2024:**

From the onset, PacifiCorp's engagement with TerraPower has been based on the understanding that Natrium demonstration project must be cost effective for our customers. This was emphasized in a June 2021 news release, which is available here: [TerraPower, Wyoming Governor and PacifiCorp announce efforts to advance nuclear technology in Wyoming](#)

In this new release, then president and CEO of Rocky Mountain Power, Mr. Gary Hoogeveen is quoted:

*“We are currently conducting joint due diligence to ensure this opportunity is cost-effective for our customers (emphasis added) and a great fit for Wyoming and the communities we serve.”*

Despite the inclusion of the Natrium demonstration project in the preferred portfolio, PacifiCorp, as of now, has not entered into any binding contractual agreements with TerraPower concerning the Natrium Project. The Natrium project has a long lead time that requires continued evaluation of its potential. Ongoing negotiations are commercially sensitive, and any future contracts will be structured to minimize risks and costs for PacifiCorp's customers, based on the specific costs and operational details of a potentially binding agreement, once one is available for consideration. PacifiCorp is not aware of any plans for TerraPower to sell output from the Natrium to customers in California.

The 2025 IRP Action Plan related to the Natrium demonstration project will be updated accordingly.

---

Please submit your completed Stakeholder Feedback Form via email to [IRP@PacifiCorp.com](mailto:IRP@PacifiCorp.com)

Thank you for participating.