



Portland General Electric Company  
Legal Department  
121 SW Salmon Street • Portland, Oregon 97204  
503-464-7822 • Facsimile 503-464-2200

Loretta I. Mabinton  
Associate General Counsel

October 12, 2018

***Via Electronic Filing***

Oregon Public Utility Commission  
Attention: Filing Center  
201 High Street, Ste. 100  
PO Box 1088  
Salem OR 97308-1088

**Re: UM 1934 - Request for Acknowledgment of the Final Short List of Bidders in Portland General Electric Company's 2018 Request for Proposals for Renewable Resources – Errata**

Attention Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing please find an errata to Portland General Electric Company's (PGE) Request for Acknowledgment of the Final Short List of Bidders in PGE's 2018 Request for Proposals for Renewable Resources (Request) in Docket UM 1934. Upon further review of the filing made on October 3, 2018, PGE discovered that Table 3 and Table 4 in the Request contained inaccurate information. Final updated Table 3 has been sent out to the parties that signed the General Protective Order No. 18.063 and the Modified Protective Order No. 18.366 on October 12, 2018 via Fed-Ex delivery. Final updated Table 4 is attached. PGE has been in contact with the IE regarding this errata.

Please direct any questions regarding this filing to Jimmy Lindsay at [jimmy.lindsay@pgn.com](mailto:jimmy.lindsay@pgn.com) or (503) 464-8311.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Loretta Mabinton". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a white background.

Loretta I. Mabinton  
Associate General Counsel

LM: sj

Enclosure

later be supplemented without lost opportunity costs. While the sensitivity is useful to review, PGE notes that a major purpose of this 2018 RFP is to secure the benefits of expiring federal tax credits that will otherwise make new renewable projects more expensive in the future. The impetus behind the 2016 IRP, 2016 IRP Addendum, and 2018 RFP is that renewables are unlikely to be as cost effective in the next ten years as they are today. For that reason, PGE appreciates but does not overly emphasize the portfolio results associated with the average bid cost energy fill study assumption.

When looking at all study assumption sensitivities together, the top performing five portfolios identified under standard study assumptions was found to be robust. PGE identified each portfolio’s average cost and risk result under all study assumptions sensitivities. The top five portfolio results under PGE’s sensitivity analyses were largely consistent with PGE’s results under standard study assumptions. As can be observed in Table 4, Portfolio F-6 is also considered a top performing portfolio when averaging cost and risk results for all study assumption combinations.

**Table 4: Portfolio Analysis Study Assumption Sensitivity Results in 2018 RFP**

Standard Study Assumptions		Average Sensitivity Analysis	
Portfolios	Rank	Portfolios	Rank
F-17	1	F-17	1
F-14	2	F-16	2
F-16	3	F-6	3
F-3	4	F-14	4
F-13	5	F-3	5

later be supplemented without lost opportunity costs. While the sensitivity is useful to review, PGE notes that a major purpose of this 2018 RFP is to secure the benefits of expiring federal tax credits that will otherwise make new renewable projects more expensive in the future. The impetus behind the 2016 IRP, 2016 IRP Addendum, and 2018 RFP is that renewables are unlikely to be as cost effective in the next ten years as they are today. For that reason, PGE appreciates but does not overly emphasize the portfolio results associated with the average bid cost energy fill study assumption.

When looking at all study assumption sensitivities together, the top performing five portfolios identified under standard study assumptions was found to be robust. PGE identified each portfolio’s average cost and risk result under all study assumptions sensitivities. The top five portfolio results under PGE’s sensitivity analyses were largely consistent with PGE’s results under standard study assumptions. As can be observed in Table 4, Portfolio F-6 is also considered a top performing portfolio when averaging cost and risk results for all study assumption combinations.

**Table 4: Portfolio Analysis Study Assumption Sensitivity Results in 2018 RFP**

Standard Study Assumptions		Average Sensitivity Analysis	
Portfolios	Rank	Portfolios	Rank
F-17	1	F-17	1
<del>F-14</del> F-16	2	F-16	2
<del>F-16</del> F-3	3	F-6	3
<del>F-3</del> F-14	4	<del>F-14</del> F-3	4
F-13	5	<del>F-3</del> F-14	5