

PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2023 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 2023 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 2024-06-10

*Name: Monica Hilding

Title: Chair

*E-mail: mohilding@gmail.com

Phone: 8016805303

*Organization: Utah Environmental Caucus

Address: 155 South Lincoln Street

City: Slc

State: UT

Zip: 84102

Public Meeting Date comments address: 06-26-2024

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.

Climate modeling, Thermal Resources options, Water Resources

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) Please update how RMP's lengthy delay of renewable and storage purchases could affect Utah Community Renewable Energy purchases --esp. with revisions under 2024 Utah Senate Bill 214-- and affect 2025 IRP horizon assumptions. 2) How is RMP-PacifiCorp taking water use into consideration for cooling the coal plants whose lives were recently extended in contravention of the 2023 IRP? 3) With RMP having filed deferred accounting orders with the Utah PSC for wildfire claims [Docket 23- 035-30] and rising insurance costs [23-035-40], respectively, and the rising insurance costs docket now moving forward, how much of the subsequent financial burden will Utah ratepayers have to shoulder alone and how much shared across PacifiCorp's grid? 4) How will geothermal advances recently demonstrated by the FORGE project be reflected as portfolio sensitivities for the 2025 IRP.

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://le.utah.gov/~2024/bills/static/SB0214.html>,

<https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/23docs/2303530/3298372303530n9-15-2023.pdf>,

<https://psc.utah.gov/2023/08/21/docket-no-23-035-40/>,

<https://www.sltrib.com/news/environment/2024/05/31/utah-lab-proves-it-pulling-heat/>

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

Recommend a portfolio sensitivity for water consumption by power plants.

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

* Required fields

Thank you for participating.

PacifiCorp Response (7/15/24):

1. PacifiCorp expects to address state policy updates in its August 14-15 public input meeting as these matters are considered.
2. The Utah coal plant lives listed in the 2023 IRP Update preferred portfolio are the same as the dates for the same coal units that were listed in the 2021 IRP preferred portfolio. From a water use and management perspective, there have been no changes. RMP will therefore manage water consumption going forward as it has been in the past, relying on a collection of water resources and water rights.
3. The matter of insurance costs and their inclusion in rates is outside the scope of the IRP.
4. PacifiCorp is considering the broad range of geothermal cost scenarios presented in the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) 2024 Annual Technology Baseline (ATB). The Company will most likely model geothermal under the ATB's "Moderate Scenario" quoted below, and the "Mature Hydro/Flash" technology option which has the lowest cost and cost forecast, and the lowest uncertainty for the moderate scenario among the technology options. The Company recognizes that the "Advanced Scenario" for Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) may become more cost competitive within the next decade; there is no plan to model that scenario at this time. However, planning for sensitivities and variants is a subject being addressed in the upcoming July 17-18 public input meeting and will also be addressed in subsequent meetings responsive to stakeholder feedback.

Moderate Technology Innovation Scenario (Moderate Scenario): Drilling advancements (e.g., doubled ROP and bit life from GeoVision baseline and reduced number of casing intervals and associated drilling materials) detailed as part of the GeoVision report ([DOE, 2019](#)) and EGS stimulation successes from DOE-funded EGS Collab and [FORGE](#) projects ([Kneafsey et al., 2022](#)); ([Dupriest and Noynaert, 2024](#)) and industry demonstration projects ([Norbeck et al., 2023](#)); ([El-Sadi et al., 2024](#)); ([So et al., 2024](#)) result in cost improvements that are fully achieved industrywide by 2035. Also, as part of 2024 ATB updates, this scenario assumes EGS power plants are built to a capacity of 40 megawatts (MW).