

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UM 1396

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF	)	RULING
OREGON	)	
	)	
Investigation into Determination of	)	
Resource Sufficiency, pursuant to	)	
Order No. 06-538.	)	

**DISPOSITION: ISSUES LIST ADOPTED**

A prehearing conference was held in this docket on November 19, 2008. The Administrative Law Judge ordered the parties to submit joint or separate Issues Lists. Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Staff) submitted their Issues List on February 13, 2009. Portland General Electric Company (PGE), Idaho Power Company, and PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, each filed letters in support of Staff’s proposed Issues List. No filings were received from the Oregon Department of Energy or the Community Renewable Energy Association (CREA).

On February 13, 2009, the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU) also filed a letter in support of Staff’s Issues List, but included an additional three issues it states should be addressed in this proceeding.

The issues proposed by Staff are as follows:

**UM 1396 Issues List**

1. How are periods defined?
  - If a resource sufficiency period is established, how often and for what reasons should the sufficiency determination be revisited?
  
2. What is the definition of resource sufficiency/ deficiency for avoided costs purposes?
  - In what ways does resource sufficiency and deficiency differ from load/ resource balance determinations?

3. What loads were used to compute the load forecast?
  - Are the load forecasts up to date?
  - Are forecasts different that are used for the utility's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), if so, how?
  - Is the load forecasting methodology currently used by the utilities accurately forecasting loads?
4. Is it appropriate to determine resource sufficiency for avoided cost filings in a different manner than is used to determine resource needs for the IRP planning process?
  - How is the IRP load and resource determination (forecast) relevant to the avoided cost sufficiency determination?
5. Must a utility be both capacity and energy deficient to be in a position of resource deficiency?
  - Can a utility that is chronically short on capacity and continuously building capacity be considered sufficient?
6. How should resource energy and capacities be determined?
  - How should a utility forecast QF capacity, and how does QF capacity factor in to the determination of the utilities' resource position or the purposes of avoided cost calculations?
  - Should capacity forecasts impact the sufficiency/deficiency periods?
7. What resources go into the termination of sufficiency/deficiency?
  - Is it appropriate to include short-term firm purchases in base load capacity when calculating resource sufficiency?
  - Should only existing resources be included in determining the resource position?
  - Should the choice of the type of avoided costs resource affect the determination of resource sufficiency?
  - Is resource sufficiency and deficiency applicable only to "firm" supply resources?
  - How does the Oregon Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) factor in to the determination of resource sufficiency?
8. How do multiple jurisdictional utilities calculate resource sufficiency?

The additional issues proposed by ICNU are as follows:

1. Should the utilities' avoided cost filings be differentiated based on their resource position?

2. Do the utilities' avoided costs methodologies accurately forecast their resources position?
3. Are the utilities acquiring resources greater than 50 MWs while they are considered resource sufficient?

Given the consensus regarding Staff's proposed issues, Staff's issue list is adopted as set forth above. The parties are instructed to formulate their testimony to address each of the issues as appropriate to their interest in the case.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 3rd day of March, 2009.

---

Patrick Power  
Administrative Law Judge