

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 2276

In the Matter of

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF
OREGON,

Approval of Justice Funding Precertification.

MEMORANDUM

In preparation for the development of a public meeting recommendation to be considered by the Commission at the May 16, 2023, public meeting, I invite precertification grant applicants to answer the following questions and respond to the following observations that are relevant to my ultimate recommendation to the Commission:

- 1) For Rogue Climate
 - a. Rogue Climate's initial April 3, 2023, request promised a more detailed budget on pages 1-2. Is the supplement the more detailed budget? This is a clarifying question, I am not requesting a new budget be filed, though Rogue Climate may file to amend its budget if it deems that appropriate.
 - b. Portland General Electric Company objects to Rogue Climate's request for PGE funds for activity in PGE's IRP and in docket UM 2273. Rogue Climate is invited to provide a response to this objection.
 - c. The initial budget Rogue Climate submitted has a slightly higher total than the second budget that was submitted; the first request totaled \$49,425 and the second request totaled \$49,375.
- 2) For the Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC)
 - a. Are the three groups listed in the supplemental filing submitted on April 21, 2023, independently eligible for grants under the agreement and rules?
 - b. What dockets or subjects will the three funded workshops be focused on?
 - c. CCC plans to engage in docket UE 416 activity. I note that CCC has not yet intervened in that docket but may do so in the future.
- 3) For Verde
 - a. No questions, but I want to clarify for Verde that ongoing Clean Energy Plan (CEP) work is no longer being addressed in docket UM 2225 but

instead in docket UM 2273. I consider Verde's request to participate in docket UM 2225 to refer to future CEP-related events in docket UM 2273 and other future CEP-related dockets.

4) Oregon Just Transition Alliance

- a. What are the groups to be funded with sub-grants? Are these groups independently eligible under the agreement or rules? (This is not necessary to answer if sub-grants are for contractor staff time.)
- b. I assume that the work to be completed by the sub-grantees is essentially the work outlined in the application. If this is incorrect, please provide explanation of alternative activities that will be conducted by the sub-grant groups.

5) Community Energy Project

- a. I note that several of the dockets outlined by Community Energy Project in its application are coming to a close; for example, docket LC 77, PacifiCorp's IRP, is essentially over, but docket LC 82, PacifiCorp's upcoming IRP, is about to begin. I consider Community Energy Project's request to participate in docket LC 77 to refer to docket LC 82.
- b. Can Community Energy Project explain the increased amount of funding allocated to PGE in its proposal?
- c. Community Energy Project plans to get engaged in activity in docket UE 416. I note that Community Energy Project has not yet intervened in that docket but may do so in the future.

I request that applicants provide any response to these question by 3:00 p.m. on May 9, 2023. I plan to publish a recommendation on May 11, 2023, which will be considered at the May 16, 2023, public meeting.

This matter is an other-than contested case that will be decided upon by the Commission at a public meeting. Comments may be provided by any person, in writing or verbally at the public meeting. Please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions, as an other-than contested case there are no *ex parte* restrictions on such communications, and I welcome comment or questions. I may be reached at nolan.moser@puc.oregon.gov or (503) 689-3622.

Dated this 2nd day of May, 2023, at Salem, Oregon.



Nolan Moser
Chief Administrative Law Judge