

From: [ROWE Sarah](#)
To: ["loretta.mabinton@pqn.com"](mailto:loretta.mabinton@pqn.com)
Cc: [MENZA Candice](#); [GRANT Michael](#)
Subject: UM 1934 Motion for a Modified PO
Date: Tuesday, October 2, 2018 11:30:47 AM

Ms. Mabinton,

The Commission has two questions about PGE's motion for a Modified Protective Order in UM 1934, PGE's 2018 R-RFP.

- (1) Has PGE conferred with the parties to UM 1934 regarding the terms of the proposed Modified Protective Order?
 - a. If yes, do any parties oppose the terms of the proposed Modified Protective Order?
 - b. If no, can PGE please confer and report back to me on how best to resolve any opposition? Given the expedited timeline for review of the shortlist, it may be faster for PGE to confer with parties than it would be for AHD to set a shortened response time for objections and then wait for that clock to run.
- (2) Paragraph 13(b) identifies persons qualified by signing a signatory page.
 - a. The language excludes parties that had bid "or planned to bid." The Commission is unable to determine which parties "had planned to bid." Is this something that is known to other parties?
 - b. To clarify the intent of paragraph 13(b), could it be simplified to read as follows?:
"Counsel for a non-bidding Party in UM 1934, ~~except a Party in UM 1934 (including attorneys) that was a bidder or planned to bid in Portland General Electric Company's 2018 Request for Proposals for Renewable Resources.~~"

Thank you,

Sarah Rowe
Administrative Law Judge
Oregon Public Utility Commission
Tel: 503-378-6106