

# Davison Van Cleve PC

Attorneys at Law

TEL (503) 241-7242 • FAX (503) 241-8160 • [jog@dvclaw.com](mailto:jog@dvclaw.com)  
Suite 400  
333 SW Taylor  
Portland, OR 97204

August 5, 2015

***Via Electronic Filing and Federal Express***

Public Utility Commission of Oregon  
Attn: Filing Center  
201 High St. SE, Suite 100  
Salem OR 97301-3612

Re: PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC  
2015 General Rate Case  
**Docket No. UE 294**

Dear Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket, please find the Supplemental Power Cost Testimony of Bradley G. Mullins on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities ("ICNU").

The sealed confidential portions of ICNU's testimony will follow to the Commission via Federal Express, and will be sent via First Class U.S. Mail to the parties that have signed Protective Order No. 15-036.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jesse O. Gorsuch  
Jesse O. Gorsuch

Enclosure

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served the confidential portions of the **Supplemental Power Cost Testimony of ICNU** upon the parties shown below by sending copies via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 5th day of August, 2015.

/s/ Jesse O. Gorsuch  
Jesse O. Gorsuch

**CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON**  
ROBERT JENKS  
SOMMER TEMPLET  
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400  
PORTLAND OR 97205  
bob@oregoncub.org  
sommer@oregoncub.org

**PUC STAFF – DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
JOHANNA RIEMENSCHNEIDER  
BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION  
1162 COURT ST NE  
SALEM, OR 97301-4796  
johanna.riemenschneider@doj.state.or.us

**PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC**  
DOUGLAS C. TINGEY – 1WTC1301  
JAY TINKER – 1WTC-0702  
121 SW SALMON  
PORTLAND, OR 97204  
doug.tingey@pgn.com  
pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com

**PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON**  
JUDY JOHNSON  
P.O. BOX 1088  
SALEM, OR 97308-2148  
judy.johnson@state.or.us

**BOEHM KURTZ & LOWRY**  
KURT J. BOEHM  
36 E SEVENTH ST – STE 1510  
CINCINNATI OH 45202  
kboehm@bkllawfirm.com

**CLEANTECH LAW PARTNERS PC**  
DIANE HENKELS  
6228 SW HOOD  
PORTLAND OR 97239  
dhenkels@cleantechlaw.com

**ENERGY STRATEGIES LLC**

KEVIN HIGGINS

215 STATE ST – STE 200

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111-2322

khiggins@energystrat.com

**SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES**

JAMES BIRKELUND

548 MARKET ST –STE 11200

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

james@utilityadvocates.org

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**OF OREGON**

**UE 294**

In the Matter of )  
 )  
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC )  
COMPANY, )  
 )  
Request for a General Rate Revision. )  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**REDACTED SUPPLEMENTAL POWER COST TESTIMONY**

**OF BRADLEY G. MULLINS**

**ON BEHALF OF THE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES**

**August 5, 2015**

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Bradley G. Mullins, and my business address is 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400,  
3 Portland, Oregon 97204.

4 **Q. ARE YOU THE SAME BRADLEY G. MULLINS THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY**  
5 **SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

6 A. Yes. I have previously submitted both Opening Power Cost Testimony and Opening  
7 Testimony in this proceeding on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities  
8 (“ICNU”). ICNU is a non-profit trade association whose members are large industrial  
9 customers served by electric utilities throughout the Pacific Northwest, including Portland  
10 General Electric Company (“PGE” or the “Company”). A summary of my education and work  
11 experience can be found at ICNU/101.

12 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

13 A. My testimony responds to the Supplemental Testimony of Company witnesses Niman,  
14 Peschka, Hager, and Dwyer on Net Variable Power Costs (“NVPC”), including the Company’s  
15 proposed changes to the 2016 maintenance outage schedule for Port Westward I.<sup>1/</sup>

16 **Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF YOUR TESTIMONY**

17 A. On June 30, 2015, the Company filed an update to its planned thermal maintenance outage  
18 schedule for 2016.<sup>2/</sup> The update increased Port Westward I’s maintenance outage in the spring  
19 of 2016 by 52 days to permanently repair one of the plant’s gas turbine rotors.<sup>3/</sup> The Company  
20 states that the rotor was damaged by its contractor while the contractor was performing  
21 maintenance work.<sup>4/</sup> This increase to Port Westward I’s planned outage is likely to materially

---

<sup>1/</sup> PGE/1600

<sup>2/</sup> Docket No. UE 294, PGE Planned Thermal Maintenance Update (June 30, 2015).

<sup>3/</sup> PGE/1600 at 3:2-19; PGE/1601C at 3.

<sup>4/</sup> Id. at 3:14-16.

1 increase the Company's 2016 NVPC forecast because it will need to purchase replacement  
2 power while the plant is out of service. However, because the Company admits that the  
3 extension to Port Westward I's 2016 planned outage was caused by contractor error, and  
4 because the outage could have been conducted in a more cost-effective manner in 2015, the  
5 Commission should not require customers to assume these increased replacement power costs  
6 through the 2016 Annual Update Tariff ("AUT") filing. Rather, those costs should be trued-up  
7 through the 2017 Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism ("PCAM").

8 **Q. WHAT IS THE TOTAL REPLACEMENT POWER COST PROPOSED IN THE 2016**  
9 **AUT AS A RESULT OF THE PROPOSED MAINTENANCE OUTAGE?**

10 A. Based on the Company's July 15, 2015 Power Cost Filing, the Company is requesting  
11 approximately \$ [REDACTED] in replacement power cost in 2016 in connection with the extended  
12 outage.<sup>5/</sup>

13 **Q. IS THERE ANY DISAGREEMENT ABOUT WHO CAUSED THE DAMAGE TO THE**  
14 **ROTOR?**

15 A. No. There is no disagreement that the damage was caused by an error on the part of the  
16 Company's contractor. As stated by the Company, "[b]ased on the findings described in the  
17 [root cause analysis (PGE/1607C)] and corroborated observations by PGE personnel at the  
18 plant, the damage resulted from the contractor's actions."<sup>6/</sup> The Company states that it is  
19 pursuing the costs of repairing the damaged equipment from the contractor under the long-term  
20 service agreement ("LTSA").

---

<sup>5/</sup> See PGE's July MONET Update, Attachment 2 (electronic file) \ToPUC\ #2016GRC-ModelSteps-  
July15Filing.xls, Model Step 93.

<sup>6/</sup> PGE/1600 at 6:13-15.

1 **Q. WHY DOES THE COMPANY SUGGEST THAT RATEPAYERS SHOULD BE**  
2 **RESPONSIBLE FOR REPLACEMENT POWER COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE**  
3 **CONTRACTOR’S ERROR?**

4 A. The Company claims it has no remedy to recover the replacement power costs associated with  
5 the outage from the contractor.<sup>7/</sup> Had the error been made by a Company employee, there  
6 would be little question whether the replacement power costs should be borne by ratepayers, as  
7 the Company has typically not been allowed to pass costs associated with imprudent actions,  
8 such as this, onto ratepayers. In this case, the only reason why the Company believes that the  
9 costs should be borne by ratepayers is the fact that the individual who made the error was a  
10 contractor.

11 **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE COMPANY?**

12 A. No. The fact that the error was caused by a contractor, rather than an employee of the  
13 Company, should have little bearing on whether ratepayers should ultimately be responsible for  
14 the replacement power costs associated with the maintenance outage. When the Company  
15 hired the contractor it undertook a process of due diligence to determine whether the contractor  
16 would perform satisfactory work,<sup>8/</sup> similar to the process that it would undertake for its own  
17 employees. The Company also indicated that it employed tenured technicians to oversee the  
18 contractor’s work,<sup>9/</sup> just as it would have overseen the work if performed by one of its own  
19 employees. Accordingly, as a policy matter, it would be inappropriate for the Company to pass  
20 imprudent costs onto ratepayers, simply because the imprudent action was performed by a  
21 contractor. If it were allowed to evade responsibility in this manner, the Company could  
22 simply hire contractors to pass any number of imprudent costs onto ratepayers.

---

<sup>7/</sup> Id. at 5:21:6:10

<sup>8/</sup> Id. at 6:16-7:7.

<sup>9/</sup> Id. at 7:8-8:15.

1 Consider, for example, a scenario where, due to a contractor's error, the cost to build a  
2 power plant ended up being twice as much as what it otherwise would have been. Under the  
3 theory that it should be absolved of responsibility related to contractor error, the Company  
4 would be allowed to pass the imprudent rate base, and associated capital costs, related to the  
5 contractor's error onto customers. This result, however, does not make sense because the  
6 Company has the responsibility to oversee the actions of the contractor in order to prevent such  
7 an outcome.

8 **Q. DO RATEPAYERS HAVE ANY CONTROL OVER THE ACTIONS OF**  
9 **CONTRACTORS?**

10 A. No. Despite its claims to the contrary, the Company has control over the actions of its  
11 contractors. To the extent that the contractors are performing tasks that have the potential to  
12 result in great costs to the Company, such as sensitive work on the rotor, the Company should  
13 ensure that the contractor is taking adequate precautions to prevent major damage to the  
14 generator. Ratepayers, on the other hand, do not have any control over the actions of the  
15 contractor, and, therefore, it is not fair to hold ratepayers responsible for costs associated with  
16 the contractor's errors.

17 **Q. IS THE TIMING OF THE OUTAGE ALSO CONCERNING?**

18 A. Yes. The Company had the option to perform the maintenance work this year, rather than  
19 postponing the maintenance until 2016. Under that option, however, the Company would have  
20 been required to seek recovery of the replacement power costs in its PCAM, which is subject to  
21 dead bands, sharing, and an earnings test. Instead, the Company has proposed to delay the  
22 outage until 2016, and as a result, is able to include the power cost impacts of the extended  
23 outage in its 2016 power cost forecast. This eliminates the impact of the dead bands, sharing  
24 bands and earnings test that would have otherwise applied if the costs were to flow through the



1 2015 PCAM. This is concerning because the Company is in control of when the outage will  
2 occur and has the ability to defer the outage until 2016 in order to collect more of the  
3 replacement power costs from ratepayers, regardless of whether deferring the outage is the  
4 most cost-effective option.

5 **Q. WAS IT THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE OPTION TO DEFER THE MAINTENANCE**  
6 **OUTAGE UNTIL 2016?**

7 A. No. In testimony, the Company alludes to the fact that performing the outage in 2016 was not  
8 the most cost effective option. The Company states that postponing the outage until 2016 was  
9 only “one of the lowest-cost options for repairing the equipment.”<sup>10/</sup> [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] <sup>11/</sup> [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] <sup>12/</sup> [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] <sup>13/</sup> [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]

18 **Q. WHAT WAS THE COMPANY’S JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTING THE MORE**  
19 **EXPENSIVE OPTION?**

20 A. The Company suggests that equipment risk as well as the need to have the resource available in  
21 the summer months was sufficient enough to warrant moving the outage to 2016.<sup>14/</sup> Lacking

---

<sup>10/</sup> Id. at 5:9 (emphasis added).  
<sup>11/</sup> PGE/1604C at 6.  
<sup>12/</sup> Id.  
<sup>13/</sup> Id.  
<sup>14/</sup> PGE/1600 at 4:21-5:4

1 any quantification of these risks, however, it is impossible to know whether the Company  
2 simply postponed the outage until 2016 to achieve greater recovery of the replacement power  
3 costs from ratepayers.

4 **Q. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND?**

5 A. It is not fair for ratepayers to bear the \$ [REDACTED] in replacement power costs caused by  
6 contractor error in base net variable power costs established in the AUT. Despite its claims in  
7 testimony, the Company does have control over the activities of contractors, whereas  
8 ratepayers have no control over these activities. In addition, the maintenance outage could  
9 have been performed in a more cost effective manner if done in 2015, when the ratepayer  
10 obligation for replacement power costs would have been subject to the PCAM design elements.  
11 Accordingly, I propose that the Commission exclude the replacement power costs associated  
12 with the proposed major maintenance activities from base net variable power costs established  
13 in the AUT. Rather, I propose that the Company be allowed to include the replacement power  
14 costs in its 2017 PCAM filing, as these costs would have otherwise been included in its 2016  
15 PCAM filing, had the most cost-effective option been selected.

16 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL POWER COST TESTIMONY?**

17 A. Yes.