

PacifiCorp - Stakeholder Feedback Form

2017 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 2017 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 2/13/17

*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: **1/26-1/27/2017** Check here
if not related to specific meeting

Additional organization attendees at meeting: Bob Davis, Myunghee Tuttle, Lori Foster, Jeffrey Einfeldt, Charles Peterson, Brenda Salter

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

Meeting process and facilitation, Volume III Studies, Flexible Capacity Reserve Requirements Study, Incremental Solar Capacity Contribution Study, Core Cases Studies.

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 notes that silence or lack of comment on any topic from the meeting listed above does not mean agreement or disagreement.

General Comments

In the past, the Division provided comments supporting the two-day meeting approach, especially when the agenda is full. As previously stated, "the Division welcomes spending adequate time on each topic so that all parties can understand the IRP more fully." Unfortunately the past two IRP meetings have reverted back into flipping through a slide presentation, much like several IRPs ago. In both instances, we rushed through the slides on the first day, finishing hours early on Friday. This time could have been used to more closely look at each slide on Thursday before moving to the next one. We recognize that the IRP team is familiar with the graphs and materials on the slides and have been working on preparing them for some time, but for others it takes a few minutes to see what is being presented on each slide. The topics are complex and difficult to dissect from a set of bar charts, including the environmental analysis, the flexible capacity reserve requirements study, and the incremental solar capacity contribution study—all of which were covered at this meeting.

The core cases were passed out in a handout, but we didn't even review them briefly to see what resources were in each core case, even though we had several hours left on Friday. The previous IRP meeting was cancelled so it had been some time since these cases were developed.

Although notably late, the Division asked the Company to walk through its responses to stakeholder feedback. We were told there was not enough time to do this. The Division requests that the Company present stakeholder comments and how the Company addressed the respective comments at a stakeholder meeting rather than on a spreadsheet. This approach provides more transparency and demonstrates the stakeholder input, if any, on the IRP process.

The Division suggests that for future IRP meetings the time is better managed so that adequate time is allowed on the first day of what is supposed to be a two-day meeting, especially when an ambitious number of slides are covered.