Richard George
Assistant General Counsel

March 7, 2013

Via Electronic Filing and U.S. Mail

Oregon Public Utility Commission Attention: Filing Center 550 Capitol Street NE, #215 PO Box 2148 Salem OR 97308-2148

Re: UM 1610 - QUALIFYING FACILITY (QF) CONTRACTING & PRICING

Attention Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing in the captioned docket are an original and five copies of:

• PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO JOINT MOTION TO STRIKE TESTIMONY

This is being filed by electronic mail with the Filing Center.

An extra copy of the cover letter is enclosed. Please date stamp the extra copy and return to me in the envelope provided. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J. RICHARD GEORGE

Assistant General Counsel

JRG:smc Enclosures cc: service list

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

DOCKET NO. UM 1610

In the Matter of OREGON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Investigation into Determination of Qualifying Facility Contracting and Pricing

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO JOINT PARTIES MOTION TO STRIKE TESTIMONY

PGE responds to the Renewable Energy Coalition and the Community Renewable Energy Association's (hereafter "Movants") Joint Motion to strike as follows ("Joint Motion"). For the reasons discussed below, the ALJ should deny the Joint Motion or alternatively, move the issue that is the subject of this dispute (6B) to Phase II, where, based on Movants' logic, it could appropriately reside.

The issue at issue in this dispute, 6B, reads as follows: "When is there a legally enforceable obligation?" The issue Movants suggest PGE has also discussed in its testimony is 6C: "What is the maximum time allowed between contract execution and power delivery?"

While related, these are issues distinct. Our testimony addresses only issue 6B, not 6C.

As a preliminary matter, the Joint Motion mischaracterizes PGE's testimony. Movants suggest that PGE has submitted testimony on the time between contract execution and power delivery.

At no point in our testimony on issue 6B does PGE reference the contract. Indeed there is a clear distinction between a contract and a legally enforceable obligation, which is the subject of issue 6B. A recent FERC opinion, *Cedar Creek Wind, LLC* 137 FERC P 61006 (2011) explains the

¹ "[Movants] move to strike the limited portion of the testimony of Portland General Electric Company ('PGE') witness Rob MacFarlane and John Morton that addresses the issue of the amount of time between contract execution, or a legal obligation, and power delivery." Joint Motion at 1.

distinction: "Such commitment to sell to an electric utility, the Commission has found 'also commits the electric utility to buy from the QF; these commitments result either in contracts or in non-contractual, but binding, legally enforceable obligations'." (Quoting *JD Wind 1*, 129 FERC ¶ 61, 148 at P 25)

Issue 6B asks "when is there a legally enforceable obligation?" PGE answered that question: "no legally enforceable obligation may be created more than one year before the QF has or will have power available or a demonstrated construction period if longer than one year." At no point did our testimony address the issue in 6C, which concerns the time period between *contract execution* and power delivery.

PGE has not yet addressed issue 6C and does intend to submit testimony on that issue in Phase II. The Commission may certainly determine a process for QF interactions with utilities, which may prescribe when a draft contract is tendered to a QF and on what timeline it may be executed. The Commission may also determine when a QF project must start performing. A contract may be one way to evidence an LEO, but again, contract execution is distinct from the establishment of an LEO.

Parties are entitled to differing views regarding interpretation of an issue. PGE does not believe that Movants are prejudiced by the testimony it has submitted. Movants most certainly have an opportunity to submit responding testimony in the next round, and all parties, including utilities, may submit testimony in the final round. Because we believe we have responded only to issue 6B and because Movants may respond to it with their own testimony, we ask that Movant's motion be denied.

In the alternative, we submit that issue 6B could be moved into Phase II. Movants explain in their Joint Motion (page 6) that the issue of timing between an LEO and performance is inextricably linked with other contract issues, such as PPA timelines, contracting steps and interconnection process requirements. This logic about such a linkage supports that issue 6B should be moved into Phase II where most of the contract-related issues reside. In PGE's view issue 6B most certainly includes the temporal aspect of the LEO (and not a Commission determination of the circumstances under which an LEO is established, per *Cedar Creek Wind*). Hence, including it with the other issues that may affect the timing between an LEO and contract performance, such as the interconnection requirements, would be an appropriate alternative if the motion to strike is not denied.

Dated, this 7th day of March, 2013.

J. Richard George

Assistant General Counsel

. Miled 2

Portland General Electric Company

121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC1301

Portland, OR 97204

(503) 464-7611 (telephone)

(503) 464-2200 (telecopier)

richard.george@pgn.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day caused **PGE'S RESPONSE TO JOINT MOTION TO STRIKE TESTIMONY** to be served by electronic mail to those parties whose email addresses appear on the attached service list, and by First Class US Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed, to those parties on the attached service list who have obtained permission to receive hard copy service for OPUC Docket # UM 1610.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 7th day of March, 2013.

Sheila Cox, Legal Assistant

Portland General Electric Company

121 SW Salmon St., 1WTC1301 Portland, OR 97204

(503) 464-8583 Telephone

(503) 464-2200 Fax

sheila.cox@pgn.com

SERVICE LIST 3/7/13 OPUC DOCKET # UM 1610

Adam Bless	J. Richard George
OREGON PUBLIC UTILITIES	PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
	richard.george@pge.com
COMMISSION	nenard.george@pgc.com
adam.bless@state.or.us	
Randall J. Dahlgren	Megan Walseth Decker
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT
COMPANY	megan@rnp.org
pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	
RNP Dockets	Loyd Fery
RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT	11022 Rainwater Lane SE, Aumsville OR 97325
dockets@rnp.org	dlchain@wvi.com
Stephanie Andrus	Lisa Rackner
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC
stephanie.andrus@state.or.us	dockets@mdc-law.com
Donovan Walker	Thomas H Nelson
IDAHO POWER COMPANY	Attorney At Law
dwalker@idahopower.com	nelson@thnelson.com
Daren Anderson	Matt Krumenauer
NORTHWEST ENERGY SYSTEMS	OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
COMPANY LLC	matt.krumenauer@state.or.us
da@thenescogroup.com	
Kacia Brockman	Diane Henkels
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	Attorney at law
kacia.brockman@state.or.us	dhenkels@actionnet.net
Irion A Sanger	Melinda J Davison
DAVISON VAN CLEVE	DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC
ias@dvclaw.com	mjd@dvclaw.com;mail@dvclaw.com
S Bradley Van Cleve	John W Stephens
DAVISON VAN CLEVE	ESLER STEPHENS & BUCKLEY
bvc@dvclaw.com	stephens@eslerstephens.com;mec@eslerstephens.com
Regulatory Dockets	Bill Eddie
IDAHO POWER COMPANY	ONE ENERGY RENEWABLES
dockets@idahopower.com	bill@oneenergyrenewables.com
Glenn Montgomery	Kathleen Newman
OREGON SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES	OREGONIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY
ASSOCIATION	POLICY
glenn@oseia.org	kathleenoipl@frontier.com;k.a.newman@frontier.com
Mark Pete Pengilly	R. Bryce Dalley
OREGONIANS FOR RENEWABLE	PACIFIC POWER
ENERGY POLICY	bryce.dalley@pacificorp.com
mpengilly@gmail.com	
Mary Wiencke	John Lowe
PACIFIC POWER	RENEWABLE ENERGY COALITION
mary.wiencke@pacificorp.com	jravenesanmarcos@yahoo.com
Oregon Dockets	Brittany Andrus
PACIFICORP, DBA PACIFIC POWER	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON
oregondockets@pacificorp.com	brittany.andrus@state.or.us

Donald W Schoenbeck	Peter J Richardson
REGULATORY & COGENERATION	RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PLLC
SERVICES INC	peter@richardsonandoleary.com
dws@r-c-s-inc.com	
Gregory M. Adams	Will K. Carey
RICHARDSON & O'LEARY	ANNALA,CAREY, BAKER,ET AL, PC
greg@richardsonandoleary.com	wcarey@hoodriverattorneys.com
Mike McArthur	Richard Lorenz
ASSOCIATION OF OR COUNTIES	CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT HAAGENSEN &
mmcarthur@aocweb.org	LLOYD LLP
_	rlorenz@cablehuston.com
OPUC Dockets	Robert Jenks
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON
dockets@oregoncub.org	bob@oregoncub.org
G. Catriona McCracken	David Tooze
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	CITY OF PORTLAND – PLANNING &
catriona@oregoncub.org	SUSTAINABILITY
	david.tooze@portlandoregon.gov
Peter P. Blood	Elaine Prause
COLUMBIA ENERGY PARTNERS LLC	ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON
pblood@columbiaenergypartners.com	Elaine.prause@energytrust.org
John M. Volkman	Paul D. Ackerman
ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON	EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES COMPANY LLC
John.volkman@energytrust.org	Paul.ackerman@constellation.com
John Harvey	Toni Roush
EXELON WIND LLC	ROUSH HYDRO INC
john.harvey@exeloncorp.com	tmroush@wvi.com
James Birkelund	David A. Lokting
SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES	STOLL BERNE
james@utilityadvocates.org	dwalker@idahopower.com
Kenneth Kaufmann	Jeffrey S. Lovinger
LOVINGER KAUFMANN LLP	LOVINGER KAUFMANN LLP
kaufmann@lklaw.com	lovinger@lklaw.com
Adam Lowney	
MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC	
adam@mcd-law.com	