

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. Submit form and related documents to the IRP e-mail: IRP@PacifiCorp.com.

Yes No May we post these comments to the IRP webpage? Date of Submittal 12/31/2014
*Name: Mitalee Gupta Title: Program and Policy Associate
*E-mail: mgupta@utahcleanenergy.org Phone: 801-363-4046
*Organization: Utah Clean Energy
Address: 1014, 2nd Avenue
City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip: 84103
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.
Distributed Generation Resource Assessment Study - request for more information

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.
I am submitting this request on behalf of Utah Clean Energy, as a follow up to our previous comments (submitted on Oct 31st, 2014). In our earlier comments, we asked PacifiCorp to model a sensitivity case with an assumption of higher incentives for commercial PV systems in Utah. In an effort to better inform PacifiCorp regarding our initial request for sensitivity analysis, we are seeking some more information, to help determine the level of incentive at which commercial PV systems achieve higher penetration while remaining cost effective.

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.
PacifiCorp's Distribution Generation Resource Assessment Study and Sensitivity Analysis

We submitted our comments on PacifiCorp's Distribution Generation Resource Assessment Study on October 31st, 2014, with a recommendation for PacifiCorp to model a sensitivity case with a higher incentive (of at least \$0.90 per kilowatt) for commercial PV systems in Utah.

To determine the actual amount of incentive that will enable higher penetration of commercial PV systems in Utah, we are requesting some specific information from PacifiCorp. As mentioned earlier, the cost-effectiveness studies from

* Required fields

Utah's Solar Incentive Program docket show that the current incentive is cost-effective from the state's threshold cost test (i.e. Utility Cost Test) perspective while still providing room to increase the incentive.

The Distributed Generation Resource Assessment Study by Navigant reported that the payback period for distributed solar PV was too long and thus, even with the incentive, the capacity available through the Utah Solar Incentive Program for commercial systems would not be achieved. We specifically request data points for the plots depicted in Figure 6-7 and Figure 6-8 of the Distributed Generation Resource Study and also the input data that was used for calculating the paybacks (years) and cumulative adoption in these figures. Background information on the cost of installation of the PV system, O&M cost of the system, annual energy delivered by the system, cost of electricity and annual inflation rate in the cost of electricity used to calculate payback and adoption for small commercial PV projects depicted in Figure 6-7, would enable us understand the plot results better. It would also help us provide PacifiCorp with a more meaningful recommendation for an incentive level for sensitivity modeling purposes, at which the payback periods are lower and the penetration of commercial PV systems would be higher. Consistent with our previous request, we would then request PacifiCorp to perform a system optimizer sensitivity run assuming this new higher incentive, instead of the current decrement approach.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Thank you for participating.