



NTTG 2016-2017 Draft Study Plan Stakeholder Comment Form

Open Comment period May 12th, 2016 through May 27th, 2016

Please submit comments to info@nttg.biz

Commenter Contact Information

Date 5-20-2016
Name PacifiCorp Transmission
Organization

Stakeholder Comments

Study Plan Section	Page/Line #	Comment
IV.A.1.b	4 Tbl 2	Idaho – does the total include the UAMPS resources? Utah- what makes up the total? Wyoming- may want to itemize 887 wind, 13.87 misc and -337 coal retirement
IV.A.4	12	PAC 2015 IRP Update shows an Oregon RPS of 27% by 2025
IV.B.3	15	An explanation of the NULL case should be included in this section
IV.C.1	18	The table shows Gateway C, is this intended to be Gateway Central? This project is mostly complete except for a very small segment that PacifiCorp already owns 100% of associated ROW; and no federal permits are required.
IV.C.1.c	19	Why is this section limiting the modeling tools to just using power flow? The K allows for using both power flow and production cost modeling and hence, should allow for both.
IV.C.2	19	This section states “projects eligible for cost allocation” should this be “projects requesting cost allocation”?
VI	20	Stated under introduction that the planning committee selects cost allocation projects, should it be projects that request cost allocation treatment. Per the K a project proponent determines if they want to be considered for cost allocation not the planning committee.
VI.D	22	If a coal retirement scenario is pursued, then the plants included and timing of retirement should be taken from members integrated resource plans, not a general guess at to the number of MW retired in an area by some arbitrary date. See proposed alternative language.
VI.D.	22	Why is coal retirement being considered, this policy has not been set. If we are to consider public policy it should be policy that has been set not speculation.