

Douglas C. Tingey Associate General Counsel

August 12, 2016

Via Electronic Filing

Oregon Public Utility Commission Attention: Filing Center PO Box 1088 Salem OR 97308-1088

Re: UE 306 – PGE 2017 Decoupling Adjustment, Schedule 123

Attention Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing in Docket UE 306 is a **Motion to Admit Stipulation**, **Stipulation**, and **Joint Testimony in Support of Stipulation** between Portland General Electric Company, NW Energy Coalition, Citizens' Utility Board and Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon, the stipulating parties. These documents are being filed by electronic mail with the Filing Center.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Douglas C. Tingey

Associate General Counsel

DCT:lgh

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

UE 306

In the Matter of

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

MOTION TO ADMIT STIPULATION

2017 Decoupling Adjustment, Schedule 123

Pursuant to OAR 860-001-0350(7), Portland General Electric Company ("PGE") moves to admit into the record in this proceeding the Stipulation, dated August 10, 2016. PGE also moves that the following Joint Testimony in support of the Stipulation be admitted into the record as evidence in this proceeding:

Testimony and Exhibits	Witnesses
Stipulating Parties	Wendy Gerlitz Bob Jenks Lance Kaufman Marc Cody

DATED this 12th day of August, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas C. Tingey, OSB No. 044366

Associate General Counsel

Portland General Electric Company

121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC1301

Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 464-8926 (Telephone)

(503) 464-2200 (Facsimile)

doug.tingey@pgn.com

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

UE 306

In the Matter of

STIPULATION

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

2017 Decoupling Adjustment, Schedule 123

This Stipulation ("Stipulation") is among Portland General Electric Company ("PGE"),
Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon, the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon, and the
Northwest Energy Coalition (collectively, the "Parties"). There are no other parties in this
docket.

I. INTRODUCTION

In Order 13-459 in Docket UE 262, PGE's Schedule 123 Decoupling Adjustment was renewed for three years, through 2016. On March 1, 2016, PGE filed Advice Filing No. 16-02, seeking to renew the Schedule 123 Decoupling Adjustment for another three years beginning January 1, 2017. Schedule 123 is comprised of the Sales Normalization Adjustment ("SNA") applicable to Schedules 7 and 32, and the Lost Revenue Recovery Adjustment ("LRRA") applicable to non-residential customers, with the exceptions of Schedules 32, 532 and customers exceeding one aMW at the point of delivery. PGE proposed continuation of the SNA and replacement of the LRRA with a revenue-per-customer form of decoupling for Schedules 83/583

(31-200 kW). PGE's filing included testimony in support of its filing, and work papers. The Parties subsequently served data requests on PGE, and PGE provided responses.

The Parties reviewed PGE's filing, work papers, and data responses, and held a workshop/settlement conference on June 30, 2016. As a result of those discussions, the Parties have reached agreement settling this docket as set forth below. The Parties request that the Commission issue an order adopting this Stipulation.

II. TERMS OF STIPULATION

- 1. This Stipulation settles all issues in this docket.
- 2. The Parties agree that the SNA and LRRA should be continued for three years, beginning January 1, 2017.
- 3. The Parties further agree that during this three year renewal period minor changes to the LRRA mechanism can be made through advice filings with the Commission. Significant changes to the LRRA should occur in a general rate proceeding or other major docket. Changes to the LRRA may be proposed after the second year of the renewal period outside of a rate proceeding or other major docket if there are legislative or other changes that significantly alter the manner in which energy efficiency is accounted for.
- 4. The Stipulating Parties recommend and request that the Commission approve this Stipulation as an appropriate and reasonable resolution of the issues in this docket.
- 5. The Parties agree that this Stipulation is in the public interest and will result in rates that are fair, just and reasonable and will meet the standard in ORS 756.040.
- 6. The Parties agree that this Stipulation represents a compromise in the positions of the Parties. Without the written consent of all Parties, evidence of conduct or statements, including but not limited to term sheets or other documents created solely for use in settlement

conferences in this docket, are confidential and not admissible in the instant or any subsequent proceeding, unless independently discoverable or offered for other purposes allowed under ORS 40.190.

- 7. The Stipulating Parties have negotiated this Stipulation as an integrated document. If the Commission rejects all or any material part of this Stipulation, or adds any material condition to any final order that is not consistent with this Stipulation, each Party reserves its right: (i) to withdraw from the Stipulation, upon written notice to the Commission and the other Parties within five (5) business days of service of the final order that rejects this Stipulation, in whole or material part, or adds such material condition; (ii) pursuant to OAR 860-001-0350(9), to present evidence and argument on the record in support of the Stipulation, including the right to cross-examine witnesses, introduce evidence as deemed appropriate to respond fully to issues presented, and raise issues that are incorporated in the settlements embodied in this Stipulation; and (iii) pursuant to ORS 756.561 and OAR 860-001-0720, to seek rehearing or reconsideration, or pursuant to ORS 756.610 to appeal the Commission order. Nothing in this paragraph provides any Party the right to withdraw from this Stipulation as a result of the Commission's resolution of issues that this Stipulation does not resolve.
- 8. This Stipulation will be offered into the record in this proceeding as evidence pursuant to OAR 860-001-0350(7). The Parties agree to support this Stipulation throughout this proceeding and in any appeal, provide witnesses to support this Stipulation (if specifically required by the Commission), and recommend that the Commission issue an order adopting the settlements contained herein. By entering into this Stipulation, no Party shall be deemed to have approved, admitted or consented to the facts, principles, methods or theories employed by any other Party in arriving at the terms of this Stipulation. Except as provided in this Stipulation, no

9. This Stipulation may be signed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an original for all purposes, but all of which taken together will constitute one and the same agreement.

DATED this day of August, 2016.

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

> CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION

9. This Stipulation may be signed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an original for all purposes, but all of which taken together will constitute one and the same agreement.

DATED this day of August, 2016.

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY
COMMISSION OF OREGON

CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION

9. This Stipulation may be signed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an original for all purposes, but all of which taken together will constitute one and the same agreement.

DATED this day of August, 2016.

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

> CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION

9. This Stipulation may be signed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an original for all purposes, but all of which taken together will constitute one and the same agreement.

DATED this <u>| | day of August, 2016.</u>

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

> CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

NORTHWEST ENERGY COALKTON

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

UE 306

Joint Testimony in Support of Stipulation

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

Direct Testimony of

Wendy Gerlitz Bob Jenks Lance Kaufman Marc Cody

August 10, 2016

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction and Summary1
II.	Qualifications of Witnesses4

I. Introduction and Settlement Discussion

- 1 Q. Please state your name and position.
- 2 A. My name is Wendy Gerlitz. I am the Policy Director for the Northwest Energy Coalition
- 3 (NWEC). My qualifications appear at the end of this testimony.
- My name is Bob Jenks. I am the Executive Director of the Oregon Citizens Utility
- Board (CUB). My qualifications appear at the end of this testimony.
- 6 My name is Lance Kaufman. I am a Senior Economist with the Electric and Natural
- Gas Division of the Oregon Public Utility Commission (OPUC). My qualifications appear
- at the end of this testimony.
- My name is Marc Cody. I am a Senior Pricing Analyst for Portland General Electric
- 10 (PGE). My qualifications appear in PGE Exhibit 100.
 - Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 12 A. Our purpose is to describe the stipulation reached in this docket among Staff, the NWEC,
- 13 CUB, and PGE (the Parties) regarding the changes proposed for PGE's Schedule 123
- 14 Decoupling Adjustment.

11

- 15 Q. What is the basis for the stipulation?
- 16 A. On March 1, 2016, through PGE Advice Filing No. 16-02, PGE proposed to renew for
- three years (2017-2019) portions of Schedule 123, and to make a change to another portion
- of Schedule 123. A prehearing conference was held April 7, 2016, and a procedural
- schedule was set for this docket. The Parties reviewed PGE's filing and work papers, and
- sent and engaged in discovery. The Parties held a settlement conference on June 30, 2016,
- and as a result of those settlement discussions, the Parties reached agreement settling the
- issues in this docket as set forth below.

- Q. Please specify what PGE proposed in its Opening Testimony with respect to Schedule 123.
- 3 A. The Parties evaluated PGE's proposal below:

7

8

9

10

11

- 1) Renew the current Sales Normalization Adjustment (SNA) mechanism for Schedules 7 Residential Service and Schedule 32 Small Nonresidential Standard Service for three additional years, from 2017 to 2019.
 - 2) Discontinue the Lost Revenue Recovery Adjustment (LRRA) applicable to customers whose annual consumption is below one average megawatt in favor of a revenue-per-customer form of decoupling applicable to Schedule 83/583 (31-200 kW) customers.

Q. Why did PGE propose to renew the Schedule 7 and 32 SNA?

- A. PGE proposed to renew the SNA for these two schedules because it is consistent with
 OPUC policy as stated in OPUC Order 13-459. Specifically, in this order, the Commission
 cited decoupling as achieving the goals of removing the relationship between sales and
 profits, mitigating PGE's disincentives to promote energy efficiency, and improving PGE's
 ability to recover its fixed costs. Because the Parties are generally in agreement with these
 broad policy goals, the Parties agreed to extend the Schedule 7 and 32 SNA mechanism for
 an additional three years as requested by PGE.
- Q. Why did PGE propose to eliminate the LRRA and replace it with a revenue-percustomer form of decoupling for Schedule 83??
- A. In opening testimony, PGE cited three reasons:
- 1) Explore the implications of applying a revenue-per-customer form of decoupling for customers larger than 30 kW.

- 2) Eliminate the dependency on the Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO) for energy efficiency (EE) data segregated by funding sources.
 - 3) Anticipate potential legislative changes in EE funding mechanisms that may potentially make the LRRA problematic or obsolete.

O. How did the Parties resolve this issue?

A. Staff believes that the current LRRA mechanism is working reasonably well and is not persuaded that a change is warranted. In addition, Staff, CUB, and NWEC expressed concern that changes to Schedule 123 should only be made during a general rate proceeding or other major docket. While PGE disagreed with this venue viewpoint, for the purposes of settlement, the Parties agreed to maintain the current LRRA mechanism for another three years, consistent with the SNA mechanism for Schedules 7 and 32. The Parties also agreed that minor changes to the LRRA mechanism could occur through Advice Filings, but that significant changes should occur as mentioned above in a general rate proceeding or other major docket. The Parties left open the possibility of changing the LRRA mechanism during the second year of the renewal period should legislative or other changes in the manner in which EE is accounted for occur.

II. Qualifications of Witnesses

- 1 Q. Ms. Gerlitz, please state your educational background and qualifications.
- 2 A. I am
- 3 Q. Mr. Jenks, please state your educational background and qualifications.
- 4 A.
- 5 Q. Mr. Kaufman, please state your educational background and qualifications.
- 6 A.
- 7 Q. Does this complete your testimony?
- 8 A. Yes.