

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 1789, UE 311, UP 344

In the Matters of

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC
COMPANY,

Application to Defer Revenues and Costs
Related to the Environmental Remediation
Costs Recovery Adjustment,
Schedule 149 (UM 1789);

Schedule 149, Environmental Remediation
Costs Recovery Adjustment (UE 311);

and

Application for Approval of Sale of Harborton
Restoration Project Property (UP 344)

MEMORANDUM

DISPOSITION: ORAL ARGUMENT AGENDA ESTABLISHED

As previously noticed, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon will hold oral argument in these proceedings on January 20, 2017. The purpose is to elicit additional explanatory information from the parties regarding the meaning of the stipulation and how it serves the public interest.

The Commission requests Portland General Electric Company (PGE) to start with an overview of the stipulation filed in these dockets. The overview should explain the mechanics of the stipulation and how it will apply in the near- and long-term.

Following the overview, the Commission requests all parties to address the following questions:

1. What issues have been foreclosed, if any, for future review?
2. What is each party's understanding regarding the Commission's ability to review and revise the Portland Harbor Environmental Remediation Account (PHERA) mechanism?
 - a. Who triggers a review?
 - b. When is a review triggered?
 - c. What is the parties' understanding of the term "significant new information" as used in the stipulation?
 - d. What is the forum for such a review?

3. What is the benefit to ratepayers of adopting a cost recovery mechanism, subject to certain review and revision, at this time? Why must rate treatment of the Harborton Restoration Project be coupled with the adoption of a cost-recovery mechanism for remediation expenses?
4. Under the terms of the stipulation, how will the parties and the Commission address issues regarding the prudence of PGE's actions?
5. How will the hold-harmless provision related to Harborton Restoration Project development costs be applied? Will insurance proceeds or other sources of revenue be used in any manner or for any period to offset these costs?
6. What is each party's understanding of the significance of the list of eligible sites in Appendix A to the stipulation?
7. With regard to insurance proceeds:
 - a. How will the parties and the Commission assess PGE's pursuit of insurance proceeds?
 - b. Under the terms of the stipulation, what incentives does PGE have to make sure it pursues all insurance claims?
 - c. When are insurance proceeds expected to come forth?
8. How is the stipulation consistent with the Commission's decision in docket UM 1635 relating to Northwest Natural Gas Company's recovery of environmental remediation costs?

Commission Chair Hardie will allocate the time and order of the parties' responses as appropriate.

The Commissioners and administrative law judge may ask the parties additional questions.

Dated this 13th day of January, 2017, at Salem, Oregon.



Ruth Harper
Administrative Law Judge