

Stakeholder Working Group #2 – July 7, 2025

Participants

NorthWestern Energy	Stakeholders
Olson, Megan	Leuthold, Jack (Northern Plains Resource Council)
Stajcar, Matthew	Fitzmaurice, Nicholas (MEIC)
Shafer, Jonathan	Glenn, Evora (City of Missoula)
Seitz, Brandt	Morris, Robert (Montana Technological University)
	Matson, Gary (Matson's Laboratory)
	Goldman, Derek (NWECC)
	Mayo, Sheryl (Quantica)

Notes

Balanced Portfolio (slides 5-16)

- Discussed different scenarios and data in the Vibrant Clean Energy (VCE) study.
- NWE Comments:
 - VCE considered all Montana generation, not just NWE owned generation.

Transmission (slide 17-24)

- Stakeholder Comments:
 - Transmission should be considered in how it could contribute to capacity through regional load and resource diversity

Social Cost of Carbon (slides 27-28)

- Stakeholder Comments:
 - Social cost of carbon (SCC) and carbon tax are not necessarily the same
 - SCC is an economic consideration that should be captured.
 - SCC is a potential regulatory risk that should be considered.
 - Carbon cost is difficult to capture in a model; considerations are not necessarily quantitative.
 - Other environmental impacts are important to consider but hard to quantify, e.g. mining resources, nuclear waste, recycling turbines or panels, etc.
 - Greenhouse gas emissions should be considered.
- NWE Comments:

- Nailing down a reasonable value for SCC is difficult. Different scenarios are attempting to provide the same outcome.

Scenarios and Sensitivities (slides 29-31)

- Stakeholder Comments:
 - A midterm Colstrip retirement scenario would be helpful as all the current scenarios are early in the planning period.

Tax Credits (slide 35)

- Stakeholder Comments:
 - Energy storage costs seem high. Make sure consultant is making appropriate considerations in terms of technological advancements.