# Davison Van Cleve PC

Attorneys at Law

Suite 400 333 SW Taylor Portland, OR 97204

TEL (503) 241-7242 • FAX (503) 241-8160 • jog@dvclaw.com

June 2, 2017

## Via Electronic Filing and Federal Express

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

### Re: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO. 2017 Request for a General Rate Revision Docket No. UE 319

Dear Filing Center:

Please find enclosed the redacted version of the Opening Power Cost Testimony and Exhibit of Bradley G. Mullins on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities ("ICNU").

The confidential portions of ICNU's testimony are being handled pursuant to Order No. 17-057 and will follow to the Commission via Federal Express.

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

Sincerely,

/s/ Jesse O. Gorsuch Jesse O. Gorsuch

Enclosures

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served the confidential portions of the **Opening Power Cost Testimony of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities** upon the parties shown below by mailing a copy via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 2nd day of June, 2017

Sincerely,

<u>/s/ Jesse O. Gorsuch</u> Jesse O. Gorsuch

## CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

Robert Jenks Elizabeth Jones 610 SW Broadway, Suite 400 Portland, OR 97205 bob@oregoncub.org liz@oregoncub.org

## SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES

James Birkelund Small Business Utility Advocates 548 Market St., Suite 11200 San Francisco, CA 94104 james@utilityadvocates.org

Diane Henkels Cleantech Law Partners PC 420 SW Washington St., Suite 400 Portland, OR 97204 dhenkels@cleantechlaw.com

### FRED MEYER Kurt J. Boehm Boehm Kurtz & Lowry 36 E. Seventh St., Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OH 45202 kboehm@bkllawfirm.com

## PUC STAFF - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stephanie S. Andrus Sommer Moser PUC Staff – Dept. of Justice Business Activities Section 1162 Court St. NE Salem, OR 97301-4096 stephanie.andrus@state.or.us sommer.moser@doj.state.or.us

## PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

Stefan Brown Jay Tinker 121 SW Salmon 1WTC-0306 Portland, OR 97204 stefan.brown@pgn.com pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com

### CALPINE ENERGY

GREGORY M. ADAMS RICHARDSON ADAMS, PLLC P.O. BOX 7218 BOISE, ID 83702 greg@richardsonadams.com

### WAL-MART

Vicki M. Baldwin Parson Behle & Latimer 201 S. Main St., Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 vbaldwin@parsonbehle.com

Steve W. Chriss Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 2001 SE 10<sup>th</sup> St. Bentonville, AR 72716 stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com Kevin Higgins Energy Strategies LLC 215 State St., Suite 200 Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2322 khiggins@energystrat.com

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

## UE 319

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

## **OPENING POWER COST TESTIMONY OF**

## **BRADLEY G. MULLINS**

## **ON BEHALF OF**

## THE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS

## **OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES**

## (REDACTED VERSION)

June 2, 2017

13	А.	A summary of my education and work experience can be found at ICNU/101.
14	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
15	А.	Pursuant to the Prehearing Conference Memorandum issued on March 15, 2017, by
16		Administrative Law Judges Tracy A.G. Kirkpatrick and Ruth Harper, this matter was
17		bifurcated into separate procedural schedules for general rate case issues and net variable
18		power cost ("NVPC") issues. PGE's NVPC is collected through its Annual Update Tariff
19		("AUT"), Schedule 125. The purpose of my testimony is to address issues related to the
20		Company's NVPC forecast of \$353.6 million using the Multi-area Optimization Network
	UE 3	19 – Redacted Opening Power Cost Testimony of Bradley G. Mullins

### Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

I.

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

**INTRODUCTION** 

4 Portland, Oregon 97204.

1

2

8

9

#### PLEASE STATE YOUR OCCUPATION AND IDENTIFY THE PARTY ON WHOSE 5 Q. **BEHALF YOU ARE TESTIFYING.** 6

7 I am an independent consultant representing large energy and utility customers throughout the A.

United States. I am appearing on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities

("ICNU"). ICNU is a non-profit trade association whose members are large customers served

- 10 by electric utilities throughout the Pacific Northwest, including customers of Portland General
- 11 Electric Company ("PGE" or the "Company").

#### 12 PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE. Q.

1	Energy Transaction ("MONET") model, as described in the Direct Testimony of Niman et al.,
2	or Exhibit PGE/300. $^{1/}$

## **3 Q. WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF YOUR REVIEW OF THE COMPANY'S FILING?**

A. I have reviewed the inputs of the Company into the MONET model, and have performed
analysis of various aspects of the Company's filing. I have also issued several data requests
and reviewed the Company's responses to those requests.

## Q. DOES THIS FILING CONTAIN ADJUSTMENTS THAT YOU HAVE SUPPORTED IN PAST PROCEEDINGS?

9 A. Yes. The Company's filing includes the impact of several recommendations that ICNU has

10 raised in prior proceedings. For example, the Company's filing includes an adjustment in the

11 amount of \$4.9 million to account for the California-Oregon Border Trading Margins issue I

- 12 raised in the 2016 AUT.<sup>2/</sup> The Company's filing also includes a provision for an expected
- 13 refund associated with the Portland Hydro Project in the amount of \$9.4 million, an issue I
- 14 raised in the 2017 AUT proceeding.<sup> $\frac{3}{}$ </sup>

## 15 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS PROCEEDING?

- A. Based on my review of the Company's filing, I recommend three adjustments to its power cost
  modeling in MONET.
- 18 First, I recommend that, consistent with stipulations in past AUT proceedings, the
- 19 impacts of an extended outage at the Coyote Generating Facility be removed from the outage

PGE/300 at 1:14-15. The April 14, 2017 MONET Update of the Company reduced projected NVPC by \$1 million. See April 14, 2017 Confidential Minimum Filing Requirements ("MFR"), "\ToPUC\ #M610PUC10-070-2018 GRC.xlsm", Tab "PwrCsOut," Cell "N249."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>/ <u>In re PGE, Request for a General Rate Revision</u>, Docket No. UE 294, ICNU/100 at 3:5-11:11 (May 28, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>/ <u>In re PGE, 2017 Annual Power Cost Update Tariff</u>, Docket No. UE 308, ICNU/100 at 3:1-6:2 (June 20, 2016).

1		rate for that facility in the MONET model. The impact of this adjustment is an approximate
2		\$2.3 million reduction to NVPC.
3		Second, I recommend that a planned outage for Carty be modeled during the month of
4		, rather than the month of The impact of this adjustment is an approximate \$1.2
5		million reduction to NVPC.
6		Third, I recommend modeling oil costs at the Boardman Generating Facility based on
7		the amounts of cost incurred in 2016, a period which better corresponds to the expected
8		generation of the facility in the test period. The impact of this adjustment is an approximate
9		\$0.2 million reduction to NVPC.
10		I also recommend that the Company not be allowed to update hydro resource model
11		inputs at a later point in this proceeding in connection with the Headwater Benefits Study.
12		II. COYOTE SPRINGS FORCED OUTAGE
13 14	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR CONCERN WITH THE COYOTE SPRINGS FORCED OUTAGE RATE?
15	A.	In 2013, Coyote Springs experienced an extended outage that lasted approximately
16		
17		. <sup>4/</sup> The Company has
18		proposed to include the impact of this extended outage in its NVPC forecast in this matter. I
19		propose removing the impact of the extended outage that occurred in 2013 from the Coyote
20		Springs outage rate calculation the Company used in its NVPC forecast.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;u>See</u> MFR Vol 3 - Thermal\Thermal Forced Outage\Coyote Springs\
 #CoyoteFORCalc\_2017AUTApr\_20150215.xlsx; <u>See Also</u>, April 14 MFR \Step Documentation\ Step 40 - Coyote FOR.

#### HAS THE EXTENDED OUTAGE IN 2013 AT COYOTE SPRINGS BEEN 1 **Q**. 2 **CONTESTED IN PAST PROCEEDINGS?**

3	А.	Yes. In the 2016 AUT, Staff witness John Crider filed testimony contesting the inclusion of
4		the extended outage in the forced outage rate calculation for Coyote Springs. $\frac{5}{}$ The issue was
5		resolved in that matter in a "black-box" settlement. <sup><math>6/</math></sup> Accordingly, it was not clear in that
6		proceeding whether the Company would continue to include the 2013 data in the outage rate
7		calculation in future filings.
8		Subsequently, in the 2017 AUT, the Company's initial filing included the extended
9		2013 outage in the forced outage rate of Coyote Springs. <sup><math>\frac{7}{2}</math></sup> Mr. Crider, for Staff, and I, for
10		ICNU, both contested the inclusion of the extended outage in the forced outage rate of Coyote
11		Springs in that matter. <sup><math>\underline{8}'</math></sup> That proceeding also was resolved in a stipulation where parties
12		agreed to model Coyote Springs using a 7.0% outage rate as part of a broader settlement of
13		issues, but did not require the Company to adhere to this outage rate in future proceedings. $\frac{9}{2}$
14 15	Q.	WHY DID MR. CRIDER PROPOSE A MODIFICATION TO THE OUTAGE RATE CALCULATION IN THE 2016 AUT?
16	А.	Mr. Crider proposed to eliminate the 2013 data from the Coyote Springs outage rate calculation
17		on the basis that it is an outlier. <sup>10/</sup> Using the same rationale established in Docket No.
18		UM 1355 that requires the outage rate of coal facilities to exclude outlier years, Mr. Crider
19		recommended calculating the outage rate for Coyote Springs in a manner that excludes $2013.^{11/2}$

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>5</u>/ Docket No. UE 294, Opening Testimony of John Crider, Staff/100 at 2:1-11:6 (May 28, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>6</u>/ Docket No. UE 294, Order No. 15-356, Appen. B at 4 (Nov. 3, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>7</u>/ See, e.g., Docket No. UE 308, ICNU/100 at 12:1-14:4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>8</u>/ Docket No. UE 308, Staff/200 at 9:1-11:7; ICNU/100 at 12:1-14:4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>9</u>/ Docket No. UE 308, Stipulation ¶ 5 (Aug. 18, 2016).

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>10</u>/ Docket No. UE 294, Staff/100 at 9:11-13 (May 28, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>11</u>/ <u>Id.</u> at 10:8-20.

1 According to Mr. Crider, an outlier year, such as that experienced at Coyote Springs in 2013, is

2 not necessarily representative of expected normalized conditions in the forecast period.  $\frac{12}{}$ 

## 3 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. CRIDER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 2016 AUT?

4 A. I generally agree with the recommendation regarding the Coyote Springs outage detailed by

5 Mr. Crider in the 2016 AUT and propose to implement his recommendation in this proceeding.

## 6 Q. IS IT GOOD RATEMAKING POLICY TO REMOVE THE IMPACTS OF EXTENDED 7 OUTAGES FROM NORMALIZED POWER COST FORECASTS?

8 A. Yes. As a matter of normalization, the impacts of extended outages are best excluded from 9 forward-looking power cost forecasts. As Mr. Crider noted in his 2016 AUT testimony, the 10 Commission has previously recognized this concept by excluding extended outages from the assumed forced outage rates of coal units.<sup>13/</sup> The principle holds true for baseload gas 11 12 resources as well. Base rates are more appropriately established under an assumption that the Company will be capable of operating its system without experiencing major unexpected 13 14 outages. Embedding extended outages into an outage rate calculation in a power cost forecast 15 is the equivalent of having an expectation that the Company will experience a major outage in 16 the test period. While it certainly is possible that major outages may occur in the future, the 17 Company's Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism is designed to accommodate the costs and 18 risks associated with such outages.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>12/</u> <u>Id.</u> at 9:14-10:7

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>13</u>/ <u>Id.</u> at 3:17-4:10 (<u>citing</u> Docket No. UM 1355, Order Nos. 09-479 and 10-414).

## 1Q.HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO CALCULATE THE OUTAGE RATE FOR COYOTE2SPRINGS IN THIS PROCEEDING?

- 3 A. Similar to my recommendation in the 2017 AUT, I propose to calculate the outage rate for
- 4 Coyote Springs using the average equivalent forced outage rate ("EFOR") over the four years
- 5 2012, 2014, 2015, and 2016, excluding 2013. This calculation has been detailed in Table 2,
- 6 below:

## CONFIDENTIAL TABLE 1 Proposed EFOR Calculation for Coyote Springs



## Q. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF MODELING THIS OUTAGE RATE FOR COYOTE 8 SPRINGS IN THE MONET MODEL?

- 9 A. The impact of using the outage rate calculation detailed in the above figure is a reduction to
- 10 NVPC of approximately \$2.3 million.
- 11 III. CARTY PLANNED OUTAGE SCHEDULING

## Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION RELATED TO OUTAGE SCHEDULING FOR THE CARTY GENERATING STATION?

- 14 A. As the Company's most economic resource, the Carty Generating Station should undergo
- 15 planned maintenance in a way that minimizes costs to customers. For this reason, I
- 16 recommend modeling the expected planned outage at the Carty Generating Station in 2018 in
- 17 the month of , rather than the month of . As a general principle, planned
- 18 maintenance outages are most appropriately scheduled in a manner that results in the least cost

2		\$1.2 million reduction to NVPC, and thus, such a change is appropriately applied to the
3		Company's filing.
4 5	Q.	WHAT DEGREE OF CONTROL DOES THE COMPANY HAVE OVER THE TIMING OF PLANNED OUTAGES?
6	A.	Unlike forced outages, where the Company has little control over the timing of when a plant is
7		taken offline, planned outages represent major maintenance activities that are scheduled well in
8		advance of when the generating facility will be taken offline. These sorts of major
9		maintenance activities may occur periodically, and utilities will commonly schedule them in
10		time periods when the outage will produce little to no additional cost on the utility system. For
11		example, if a utility expects that prices will be sufficiently low in certain periods of the year
12		when a resource will be offline anyway for economic reasons, the utility will often schedule
13		planned maintenance activities during such periods, to avoid the opportunity costs of not being
14		able to earn revenues relative to the market when the resource is offline.
15 16	Q.	WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO PLAN OUTAGES FOR THE CARTY GENERATING STATION AT THE MOST ECONOMICAL TIME?
17	A.	The Carty Generating Station is the Company's most economic thermal resource with a heat
18		rate of around 6,688 Btu/kWh, $\frac{14}{}$ and thus, the timing of planned outages at the Carty
19		Generating Station can have more significant impacts on power costs than other resources.
20		The economic nature of the Carty Generation Station is relevant from the relatively high
21		capacity factor of approximately % simulated in the MONET model. To put it into

to ratepayers. In this case, moving the outage from **to results** in an approximate

22 perspective, the Company's Beaver and Boardman facilities respectively operate at a %

1

<sup>14/</sup> Docket No. 294 at PGE/300 at 6:13.

1		and % capacity factor in the MONET model. Since the Carty Generating Station is
2		economic in more hours of the year, the timing of planned outages at the Carty Generating
3		Station has the potential to produce greater impacts on power costs than other resources. For
4		those other resources, which are down most of the year for economic reasons, the timing of
5		planned outages is less important.
6 7	Q.	WHY IS THE THE OPTIMAL MONTH TO CONDUCT OUTAGES AT CARTY?
8	A.	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE
13 14 15	Q.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NVPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?
13 14 15 16	<b>Q.</b> A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NVPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY? The Company proposes to include approximately <b>Second</b> in costs associated with oil at the
13 14 15 16 17	<b>Q.</b> A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NVPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY? The Company proposes to include approximately <b>Sector</b> in costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ol>	<b>Q.</b> A. <b>Q.</b>	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NVPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately for the costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> </ol>	Q. A. Q. A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NYPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately sime in costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?         The Company's forecast is not tied to the generation output at Boardman, but rather, is tied to a
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	Q. A. Q. A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NYPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately state in costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?         The Company's forecast is not tied to the generation output at Boardman, but rather, is tied to a four-year average oil consumption over the period 2013 through 2016.
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	Q. A. Q. A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NVPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately for the costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?         The Company's forecast is not tied to the generation output at Boardman, but rather, is tied to a four-year average oil consumption over the period 2013 through 2016.         DO YOU AGREE WITH THE COMPANY'S FORECAST?
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NYPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately for the costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?         The Company's forecast is not tied to the generation output at Boardman, but rather, is tied to a four-year average oil consumption over the period 2013 through 2016.         D YOU AGREE WITH THE COMPANY'S FORECAST?         No. In the test period, Boardman is expected to operate at a low capacity factor, relative to its
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	IV. BOARDMAN OIL USE         WHAT AMOUNT OF COSTS HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO INCLUDE IN NYPC FOR OIL USED AT THE BOARDMAN GENERATING FACILITY?         The Company proposes to include approximately for the costs associated with oil at the Boardman Generating Facility.         HOW DID THE COMPANY FORECAST THE COST OF OIL FOR BOARDMAN?         The Company's forecast is not tied to the generation output at Boardman, but rather, is tied to a four-year average oil consumption over the period 2013 through 2016.         DO YOU AGREE WITH THE COMPANY'S FORECAST?         No. In the test period, Boardman is expected to operate at a low capacity factor, relative to its average operations over the period 2013 through 2016. This can be noted in Confidential



## CONFIDENTIAL TABLE 2 Historical Generation Levels and Oil Consumption at Boardman

As can be noted from Confidential Table 2, the Company currently forecasts generation levels at Boardman that correspond closely to the generation level experienced in 2016, in contrast to the average generation experienced over the four-year period. For that reason, it is less consistent to use the average cost of oil over the four-year period for the forecast, as the Company has done in its filing. This treatment of oil costs for Boardman also better corresponds to the way that the Company accounts for other chemical costs, which are generally tied to expected plant output rather than a historical, four-year average.

- 8 Q. WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE?
- 9 A. I recommend forecasting the amount of costs related to oil consumption at the Boardman
- 10 generating facility based on the amount of oil consumed in 2016. This results in an oil cost

11 forecast of approximately \$

## 12 Q. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF YOUR RECOMMENDATION?

A. Forecasting oil consumption costs at Boardman based on the amount consumed in 2016 will
 reduce NVPC by approximately \$0.2 million.

1		V. HEADWATER BENEFITS STUDY
2	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE HEADWATER BENEFITS STUDY.
3	A.	The Northwest Power Pool conducts a Headwater Benefits Study that uses historical
4		streamflow to simulate output from Northwest hydroelectric resources. As explained in its
5		testimony, the Company uses this study to develop the inputs to its MONET model for the
6		Company's hydro resources. <sup>15/</sup> In its direct testimony, the Company stated that it was
7		"currently validating the results" $\frac{16}{16}$ of the most recent Headwater Benefits Study and would
8		include those results in its April MONET update.
9 10	Q.	DID THE COMPANY INCLUDE THE RESULTS OF THE MOST RECENT HEADWATER BENEFITS STUDY IN ITS APRIL MONET UPDATE?
11	A.	No. The Company stated that it has "yet to resolve an unexplained issue affecting the study
12		results." <sup>17/</sup> The Company did not identify whether it planned to include the results of the study
13		in a later MONET update, assuming it was able to resolve this "unexplained issue."
14 15	Q.	DO YOU SUPPORT UPDATING THE HEADWATER BENEFITS STUDY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
16	A.	No. As I understand, updating the Headwater Benefits Study impacts the amount of energy
17		and capacity available from hydroelectric facilities in the MONET model simulation. The
18		assumptions related to hydro output are relatively important inputs into the power cost
19		simulations the Company performs with the MONET model. Accordingly, it would be unfair
20		to parties to allow the Company to update this single aspect of its filing, after parties have had
21		the opportunity to file responsive testimony. If the Company is allowed to modify resource

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>15/</u> PGE/300 at 32:17-33:3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>16/</u> <u>Id.</u> at 32:21-33:3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>17/</u> PGE/1500 at 7:4.

7	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR OPENING POWER COST TESTIMONY?
6		proceeding.
5		its supplemental testimony is not a reason to incorporate that update at a later point in this
4		the Company was unable to complete its analysis of the Headwaters Benefit Study in time for
3		At this stage in the proceeding, resource attributes should remain fixed. The fact that
2		to propose modifications to resource attributes of other facilities as well.
1		attributes, such as those related to its hydro facilities, parties should have similar opportunities

8 A. Yes.

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

## **OF OREGON**

## UE 319

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

## EXHIBIT NO. ICNU/101

## **REGULATORY APPEARANCES OF BRADLEY G. MULLINS**

1	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE A LIST OF YOUR REGULATORY APPEARANCES.
2	А.	I have sponsored testimony in the following regulatory proceedings:
3		• Or.PUC, UM 1811: In re Portland General Electric Company, Application for
4		Transportation Electrification Programs
5		• Or.PUC, UM 1810: In re Pacific Power & Light Company, Application for
6		Transportation Electrification Programs
7		• Wa.UTC, UE-161204: In re Pacific Power & Light Company, Revisions to Tariff
8		WN-U-75 (Net Removal Tariff)
9		• Wa.UTC, UE-161123: In re Puget Sound Energy's Revisions to Tariff WN U-60,
10		Adding Schedule 451, Implementing a New Retail Wheeling Service
11		• Bonneville Power Administration, BP-18: 2018 Joint Power and Transmission Rate
12		Proceeding
13		• Or.PUC, UP 334 (Cons.): In re Portland General Electric Company Application for
14		Approval of Sale of Harborton Restoration Project Property
15		• Ar.PSC, 16-028-U: In re An Investigation of Policies Related to Renewable
16		Distributed Electric Generation
17		• Ar.PSC, 16-027-R: In re Net Metering and the Implementation of Act 827 of 2015
18		• Ut.PSC, 16-035-01: In re the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of
19		the 2016 Energy Balancing Account
20		• Wa.UTC, UE-160228, UG-160229: In re Avista Corporation Request for a General
21		Rate Revision

1	•	Wy.PSC, 20000-292-EA-16: In re the Application of Rocky Mountain Power to
2		Decrease Current Rates by \$2.7 Million to Recover Deferred Net Power Costs
3		Pursuant to Tariff Schedule 95 and to Increase Rates by \$50 Thousand Pursuant to
4		Tariff Schedule 93
5	•	Or.PUC, UE 307: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, 2017 Transition Adjustment
6		Mechanism
7	•	Or.PUC, UE 308: In re Portland General Electric Company, 2017 Annual Power Cost
8		Update Tariff (Schedule 125)
9	•	Or.PUC, UM 1050: In re PacifiCorp, Request to Initiate an Investigation of Multi-
10		Jurisdictional Issues and Approve an Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Protocol
11	•	Wa.UTC, UE-152253: In re Pacific Power & Light Company, General rate increase
12		for electric services
13	•	Wy.PSC, 20000-469-ER-15 In The Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain
14		Power for Authority of a General Rate Increase in Its Retail Electric Utility Service
15		Rates in Wyoming of \$32.4 Million Per Year or 4.5 Percent
16	•	Wa.UTC, UE-150204: In re Avista Corporation, General Rate Increase for Electric
17		Services
18	•	Wy.PSC, 20000-472-EA-15: In re the Application of Rocky Mountain Power to
19		Decrease Rates by \$17.6 Million to Recover Deferred Net Power Costs Pursuant to
20		Tariff Schedule 95 to Decrease Rates by \$4.7 Million Pursuant to Tariff Schedule 93

Regulatory Appearances of Bradley G. Mullins Docket No. UE 319

1	•	Wa.UTC, UE-143932: Formal complaint of The Walla Walla Country Club against
2		Pacific Power & Light Company for refusal to provide disconnection under
3		Commission-approved terms and fees, as mandated under Company tariff rules
4	•	Or.PUC, UE 296: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, 2016 Transition Adjustment
5		Mechanism
6	•	Or.PUC, UE 294: In re Portland General Electric Company, Request for a General
7		Rate Revision
8	•	Or.PUC, UM 1662: In re Portland General Electric Company and PacifiCorp dba
9		Pacific Power, Request for Generic Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism Investigation
10	•	Or.PUC, UM 1712: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, Application for Approval of
11		Deer Creek Mine Transaction
12	•	Or.PUC, UM 1719: In re Public Utility Commission of Oregon, Investigation to
13		Explore Issues Related to a Renewable Generator's Contribution to Capacity
14	•	Or.PUC, UM 1623: In re Portland General Electric Company, Application for
15		Deferral Accounting of Excess Pension Costs and Carrying Costs on Cash
16		Contributions
17	•	Bonneville Power Administration, BP-16: 2016 Joint Power and Transmission Rate
18		Proceeding
19	•	Wa.UTC, UE-141368: In re Puget Sound Energy, Petition to Update Methodologies
20		Used to Allocate Electric Cost of Service and for Electric Rate Design Purposes
21	•	Wa.UTC, UE-140762: In re Pacific Power & Light Company, Request for a General
22		Rate Revision Resulting in an Overall Price Change of 8.5 Percent, or \$27.2 Million

Regulatory Appearances of Bradley G. Mullins Docket No. UE 319

1	•	Wa.UTC, UE-141141: In re Puget Sound Energy, Revises the Power Cost Rate in
2		WN U-60, Tariff G, Schedule 95, to reflect a decrease of \$9,554,847 in the
3		Company's overall normalized power supply costs
4	•	Wy.PSC, 20000-446-ER-14: In re the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for
5		Authority to Increase Its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Wyoming
6		Approximately \$36.1 Million Per Year or 5.3 Percent
7	•	Wa.UTC, UE-140188: In re Avista Corporation, General Rate Increase for Electric
8		Services, RE: Tariff WN U-28, Which Proposes an Overall Net Electric Billed
9		Increase of 5.5 Percent Effective January 1, 2015
10	•	Or.PUC, UM 1689: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, Application for Deferred
11		Accounting and Prudence Determination Associated with the Energy Imbalance
12		Market
13	•	Or.PUC, UE 287: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, 2015 Transition Adjustment
14		Mechanism.
15	•	Or.PUC, UE 283: In re Portland General Electric Company, Request for a General
16		Rate Revision
17	•	Or.PUC, UE 286: In re Portland General Electric Company's Net Variable Power
18		Costs (NVPC) and Annual Power Cost Update (APCU)
19	•	Or.PUC, UE 281: In re Portland General Electric Company 2014 Schedule 145
20		Boardman Power Plant Operating Adjustment
21	•	Or.PUC, UE 267: In re PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power, Transition Adjustment, Five-
22		Year Cost of Service Opt-Out (adopting testimony of Donald W. Schoenbeck).

Regulatory Appearances of Bradley G. Mullins Docket No. UE 319