

PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2015 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 2015 IRP, including, but not limited to the process, assumptions, and analysis. In providing your feedback, PacifiCorp requests that the stakeholders identify whether they are okay with the Company posting their comments on the IRP website.

Yes No May we post these comments to the IRP webpage?

Date of Submittal 7/25/2014

*Name: Joni Zenger

Title: Technical Consultant

*E-mail: jzenger@utah.gov

Phone: (801) 530-6787

*Organization: Utah Division of Public Utilities

Address: 160 East 300 South

City: Salt Lake City

State: UT

Zip: 84111

Public Meeting Date comments address: 7/17/2014

Check here if not related to specific meeting

List additional organization attendees at cited meeting:

Charles Peterson, Sam Liu, Bob Davis, Abdinasir Abdulle,
Doug Wheelwright (phone)

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

Public input, environmental policy, process, portfolio development, draft core cases, sensitivity studies, recommendations.

Check here if any of the following information being submitted is copyrighted or confidential.

***Respondent Comment:** Please provide your feedback for each IRP topic listed above.

Qualification statement: The Division wishes to point out that silence or lack of comment on any issue on this feedback form does not mean agreement or disagreement.

Public Input

The two-day meeting approach is an improvement over past IRP meetings. The Division welcomes spending adequate time on each topic so that all parties can understand the IRP more fully. The July 17 and July 18 dates allowed time to cover most topics, with a few exceptions where we had to rush through a few slides to catch up. That being said, it was very difficult for two days to strain to hear what was being said in Oregon. (On some occasions, the Company asked Oregon to repeat the question, but for the most part, we did not hear the discussions). The Division has several questions that pertain to different slides that it will submit in a separate data request.

Environmental Policy

The Division agrees with the Company that there is so much uncertainty with regard to environmental policies—what will be enacted and how and what the courts and political outcome will be. Therefore, the fact that the 2015 IRP comes out three months before final rules makes this IRP a guessing game. The Division commends the Company for trying to proceed on the most likely outcomes.

* Required fields

Process

The Division appreciates that the Company had many of its experts present at the meeting to answer specific questions in each area, i.e., Kathy Wollums, Chad Teply, Kelsey Brown, etc. In past IRPs, the Company said “we’ll have to get back to you on that.” Here, each person jumped in with the response to each topic area of his or her expertise. Many questions and clarifications were made by having those individuals available. The Division also acknowledges that the Company has added staff members assigned to the IRP.

Portfolio Development

The Division agrees that the Company needs to limit the total number of core cases portfolios it develops in order to complete the risk analysis, sensitivities, and Volume III studies within the time constraints of the IRP. The Division has many questions pertaining to the Clean Air Act III (d) Scenario Maker (see our data request).

Draft Core Cases

The straw man draft core case portfolios appear reasonable in number and content with respect to load, natural gas prices, and environmental cases. However, the Division still has many questions pertaining to the allocated and physical cases C02-1 through C11-1.

Sensitivity Studies

The Division understands the need to conduct the various sensitivities to meet different state commission IRP orders. However, the Division reminds the Company that stakeholders will request additional sensitivities as the IRP process develops and recommends that the Company plan accordingly.

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.

Recommendations: Provide any additional recommendations if not included above - specificity is greatly appreciated. The Division requests that Rick Link take turns being physically in attendance in Utah and in Oregon for IRP public stakeholder meetings due to reasons stated above. The Division recommends that the Company continue to manage the number of portfolio cases and sensitivity studies, in order to fully complete the IRP on schedule.

Thank you for participating.

* Required fields