

Title slide

What it would take to replace the output of breaching the four lower Snake River dams

are exaggerating by only putting out the nameplate. Others are saying 1,000—we need to put our sustained capacity number up front to counter that narrative accurately.

- What are we losing?
 - 3,483 MW of nameplate capacity, including more than 2,000 MW of peaking capability to avoid power shortages during cold weather events
- How much would it cost to replace benefits of the four lower Snake River dams?
 - Upfront costs: \$XXX (with today's carbon policy) E3 please fill in these numbers. First number is construction, second is O&M and fuel? Use S1.
 - Total cost per year after that: \$XXX
 - These costs could quadruple with aggressive carbon reduction policies and absent breakthroughs in commercial-scale technology
- What are the rate impacts to public power customers?
 - Public power costs increase by 8% or \$100 per year (with today's carbon policy)
 - Public power costs increase by 65% or \$850 per year (with aggressive carbon reduction policies and absent breakthroughs in commercial-scale technology) E3, are these numbers right? The second set is about 7 times the 1% but 8.5 times the 5. Is it a rounding issue? We copied from your slide deck.
- How long would it take to replace the services from breaching the four lower Snake River dams?
 - It would take up to a decade or more to bring new resources on-line once a decision to breach the dams has been reached.

Plant	Nameplate Capacity (MW)*
Lower Granite	930
Little Goose	930
Lower Monumental	930
	693
Total	3,483

Does E3 have anything more definitive on timeline, including transmission?