

February 19, 2013

E-mail / US Mail puc.filingcenter@state.or.us

Oregon Public Utility Commission Attention: Filing Center 550 Capitol Street NE, #215 PO Box 2148 Salem OR 97308-2148

Re: UM 1610 -- INVESTIGATION INTO QUALIFYING FACILITY CONTRACTING AND PRICING

Attention Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing in UM 1610 are an original and five copies of:

Direct Testimony of Portland General Electric Company:

• PGE Exhibit 200 Macfarlane / Bettis

This document is being filed by electronic mail with the Filing Center. Hard copies will be sent via US Mail. An extra copy of this cover letter is enclosed. Please date stamp the extra copy and return it to me in the envelope provided.

This document is being served upon the UM 1610 service list.

Sincerely,

Randall J. Dahlgren

Director, Regulatory Policy & Affairs

RJD:jlt encls.

cc: UM 1610 Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day caused **PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MAP DIRECT TESTIMONY** to be served by electronic mail to those parties whose email addresses appear on the attached service list for OPUC Docket No. UM 1610.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 19th day of February, 2013.

Randall J. Dahlgren

Director, Regulatory Policy & Affairs Portland General Electric Company 121 SW Salmon St., 1WTC0702

Portland, OR 97204

Telephone: (503) 464-7021

Fax: (503) 464-7651

Email: randy.dahlgren@pgn.com

SERVICE LIST 2/19/13 OPUC DOCKET # UM 1610

Adam Bless	J. Richard George	
OREGON PUBLIC UTILITIES	PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY	
COMMISSION	richard.george@pge.com	
adam.bless@state.or.us		
Randall J. Dahlgren	Megan Walseth Decker	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT	
COMPANY	megan@rnp.org	
pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	mosantorip.org	
RNP Dockets	Loyd Fery	
RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT	11022 Rainwater Lane SE, Aumsville OR 97325	
dockets@rnp.org	dlchain@wvi.com	
Stephanie Andrus	Lisa Rackner	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC	
stephanie.andrus@state.or.us	dockets@mdc-law.com	
Donovan Walker	Thomas H Nelson	
IDAHO POWER COMPANY	Attorney At Law	
dwalker@idahopower.com	nelson@thnelson.com	
Renee M France	Matt Krumenauer	
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
renee.m.france@doj.state.or.us	matt.krumenauer@state.or.us	
Vijay A Satyal	Diane Henkels	
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	Attorney at law	
vijay.a.satyal@state.or.us	dhenkels@actionnet.net	
Irion A Sanger	Melinda J Davison	
DAVISON VAN CLEVE	DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC	
ias@dvclaw.com	mjd@dvclaw.com;mail@dvclaw.com	
S Bradley Van Cleve	John W Stephens	
DAVISON VAN CLEVE	ESLER STEPHENS & BUCKLEY	
bvc@dvclaw.com	stephens@eslerstephens.com;mec@eslerstephens.com	
Regulatory Dockets	Bill Eddie	
IDAHO POWER COMPANY	ONE ENERGY RENEWABLES	
dockets@idahopower.com	bill@oneenergyrenewables.com	
Glenn Montgomery	Kathleen Newman	
OREGON SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES	OREGONIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY	
ASSOCIATION	POLICY	
glenn@oseia.org	kathleenoipl@frontier.com;k.a.newman@frontier.com	
Mark Pete Pengilly	R. Bryce Dalley	
OREGONIANS FOR RENEWABLE	PACIFIC POWER	
ENERGY POLICY	bryce.dalley@pacificorp.com	
mpengilly@gmail.com		
Mary Wiencke	John Lowe	
PACIFIC POWER	RENEWABLE ENERGY COALITION	
mary.wiencke@pacificorp.com	jravenesanmarcos@yahoo.com	
Oregon Dockets	Brittany Andrus	
PACIFICORP, DBA PACIFIC POWER	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON	
oregondockets@pacificorp.com	brittany.andrus@state.or.us	

Donald W Schoenbeck	Peter J Richardson	
REGULATORY & COGENERATION	RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PLLC	
SERVICES INC	peter@richardsonandoleary.com	
dws@r-c-s-inc.com		
Gregory M. Adams	Will K. Carey	
RICHARDSON & O'LEARY	ANNALA,CAREY, BAKER,ET AL, PC	
greg@richardsonandoleary.com	wcarey@hoodriverattorneys.com	
Mike McArthur	Richard Lorenz	
ASSOCIATION OF OR COUNTIES	CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT HAAGENSEN &	
mmcarthur@aocweb.org	LLOYD LLP	
	rlorenz@cablehuston.com	
OPUC Dockets	Robert Jenks	
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	
dockets@oregoncub.org	bob@oregoncub.org	
G. Catriona McCracken	David Tooze	
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	CITY OF PORTLAND – PLANNING &	
catriona@oregoncub.org	SUSTAINABILITY	
	david.tooze@portlandoregon.gov	
Peter P. Blood	Elaine Prause	
COLUMBIA ENERGY PARTNERS LLC	ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON	
pblood@columbiaenergypartners.com	Elaine.prause@energytrust.org	
John M. Volkman	Paul D. Ackerman	
ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON	EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES COMPANY LLC	
John.volkman@energytrust.org	Paul.ackerman@constellation.com	
John Harvey	Toni Roush	
EXELON WIND LLC	ROUSH HYDRO INC	
john.harvey@exeloncorp.com	tmroush@wvi.com	
James Birkelund	David A. Lokting	
SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES	STOLL BERNE	
james@utilityadvocates.org	dwalker@idahopower.com	
Kenneth Kaufmann	Jeffrey S. Lovinger	
LOVINGER KAUFMANN LLP	LOVINGER KAUFMANN LLP	
kaufmann@lklaw.com	lovinger@lklaw.com	
Adam Lowney	Daren Anderson	
MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC	NORTHWEST ENERGY SYSTEMS COMPANY	
adam@mcd-law.com	LLC	
	da@thenescogroup.com	

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

UM 1610 Investigation into Qualifying Facility Contracting and Pricing

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

Direct Testimony of

Robert Macfarlane
Ty Bettis



Portland General Electric

February 19, 2013

Table of Contents

Tab	Table of Contentsi						
I.	Introduction and Summary	1					
	·						
II.	Oualifications	5					

I. Introduction and Summary

- 1 Q. Please state your name and position with Portland General Electric Company (PGE).
- 2 A. My name is Robert Macfarlane. I am an analyst in Pricing and Tariffs. My qualifications
- are listed in Exhibit PGE 100.
- 4 My name is Ty Bettis. I am the Manager of Merchant Transmission & Resource
- 5 Integration. My qualifications are listed in Section II of this testimony.
- 6 O. What is Mechanical Availability Percentage (MAP)?
- 7 A. MAP is a measure of the reliability of the renewable facility. It acts as a guarantee that the
- 8 unit will be available (ready to start, in working order) for a minimum agreed upon
- 9 percentage of time.
- A purchase power agreement often requires the seller to specify how many MWhs the
- plant is expected to produce each year. This output estimate can be expressed as the
- mechanical-availability guarantee. Such an availability guarantee requires that the
- qualifying facility (QF) be physically capable and available to produce a full output of
- electricity a certain percentage of the time, after excluding hours lost to force majeure and a
- certain amount of scheduled maintenance. The MAP encourages developers to maintain the
- readiness of their equipment for the duration of the power purchase agreement (PPA).
- 17 O. Please provide a brief description of PGE's current Mechanical Availability
- 18 Percentage (MAP) requirement.
- 19 A. As currently contained in Schedule 201, Standard Contract Power Purchase Agreement For
- 20 Intermittent Resources:

1 2 3 4 5 6		Mechanical Availability Percentages ('Guarantee of Mechanical Availability') 3.1.10.1 Ninety-one percent (91%) for the first Contract Year; And 3.1.10.2 Ninety-five percent (95%) beginning Contract Year two and extending			
7		throughout the remainder of the term."			
8	Q.	Does PGE recommend changes to the MAP?			
9	A.	PGE recommends retaining a 91% MAP in Contract Year 1, and a 95% MAP beginning in			
10		Contract Year 2 and extending to the end of the term. We do, however, recommend an			
11		explicit recognition of planned maintenances as described below.			
12	Q.	How were the percentages determined and why are they appropriate?			
13	A.	The recommended MAP is in line with industry standards as demonstrated below and cited			
14		in footnotes 1-5.			
15	Q.	As currently written, is there a planned maintenance exception in PGE's MAP?			
16	A.	No.			
17	Q.	Does PGE recommend a planned maintenance exception as part of the MAP?			
18	A.	Yes. PGE recommends allowing up to 200 hours per unit for planned maintenance during			
19		the year. The availability for the MAP calculation is then based on the remaining hours.			
20	Q.	How does PGE propose "availability" be calculated?			
21	A.	Calculation of "availability" should be aggregated on a turbine-by-turbine basis, rather than			
22		on a project-wide basis. To clarify, if one turbine (of a multiple turbine farm) is down for			
23		maintenance, but others are available, the entire plant would not be considered			
24		"unavailable." To demonstrate, we recommend a calculation similar to PacifiCorp's, shown			
25		below:			

- 1 % Availability = $\{ [(H \times N) (Sum \text{ of Downtime Hrs for N Turbines})]/(H \times N) \} \times 100\%$
- 2 H = Number of hours in contract year (minus planned maintenance)
- N = Number of turbines in the facility
- 4 Planned maintenance outages would not be considered part of "downtime hours" for this
- 5 calculation.
- 6 Q. What would be considered "planned maintenance?"
- 7 A. Outages scheduled 90 days in advance, with PGE's prior written consent.
- 8 Q. Is PGE's proposal more lenient than the current MAP?
- 9 A. Yes, based on total annual hours the maintenance carve out and remaining percentage
- provide an actual MAP equivalent to 88.9% in the first year and 92.8% in all other years.
- This compares with the current percentages of 91% in the first year and 95% in all
- subsequent years.
- O. Does PGE's 2011 Renewable Implementation Plan cite a 92% mechanical availability
- 14 expectation for PGE's Biglow Canyon Wind project?
- 15 A. No. Table 3 in the 2011 Renewable Implementation Plan refers to a generic combined cycle
- 16 combustion turbine (CCCT) alternative to Biglow Canyon. This apparently has been
- misinterpreted as an availability factor for the Biglow Canyon Wind project. However, 92%
- represents the annual average expected availability of a CCCT, based on reductions for
- scheduled maintenance and an allowance for forced outages. The 92% availability figure
- 20 referenced does not reflect a forecast or estimate of Biglow Canyon's availability.
- 21 Q. Is PGE's proposed MAP achievable?
- 22 A. Yes. PGE's MAP is written to provide incentive for the efficient operation of renewable
- QF facilities. PGE's own wind resource Biglow Canyon has been able to consistently

- achieve 95% availability without a planned maintenance exception. Further,
- 2 95% availability is well in line with the industry standard.

	Table 1			
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	
2008	* 92.8%			
2009	96.8%	* 97.5%		
2010	95.9%	98.3%	* 92.8%	
2011	96.3%	97.5%	97.4%	
2012	98.5%	98.8%	98.6%	

Table 1: historical availability data on the three phases of the PGE-owned Biglow Canyon wind farm. The availability percentage includes the hours actually available divided by the number of hours in the month (with no planned maintenance exception).

- 3 Q. Please provide evidence that a 95% MAP with a maintenance exception is within the
- 4 "industry standard."

7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

- 5 A. In Stoel Rives' "The Law of Wind: A Guide to Business and Legal Issues¹," the following
- 6 recommendation on Mechanical Availability Guarantees is provided:

Typical mechanical-availability guarantees provide for a guarantee of a mechanical-availability percentage in each contract year of 95 percent. The mechanical availability percentage is a fraction, the numerator of which is the actual number of hours in the contract year during which the turbines were mechanically available for operation, and the denominator of which is the theoretical number of hours during the contract year in which the turbines could have been mechanically available to produce electricity.

- Further, a survey of manufacturer data (footnotes 2,3,&4 below²³⁴) shows that major
- companies estimate a 97% availability factor per turbine (all available hours) if the

^{*}First year of operation

¹ http://www.stoel.com/Files/LawOfWind_06.pdf.

² http://www.huronwind.com/main.php?page=data.

http://www.geenergyfinancialservices.com/press_room/publications/GEA14954C15-MW-Broch.pdf.

⁴ http://www.ge-energy.com/wind

- 1 QF elects to allow the manufacturer to perform maintenance. Vestas even goes so
- far as to offer liquidated damages if 97% availability is not maintained⁵.

II. Qualifications

- 3 Q. Mr. Bettis, please state your educational background and qualifications.
- 4 A. I received both a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration and Master of
- 5 Science degree in Management and Organizational Leadership from Warner Pacific College.
- I have been employed by PGE for 24 years, the last 14 years in Power Operations.
- 7 During my time in Power Operations, I have worked as a Prescheduler, Day-Ahead Power
- 8 Trader, Transmission Analyst, Variable Energy Resource Integration Analyst, and most
- 9 recently as the Manager of Merchant Transmission & Resource Integration. I also served as
- the Project Manager of PGE's first two Wind Integration Studies. Currently, I am the Vice-
- 11 Chair of the WECC's Variable Generation Subcommittee and a member of the Board of
- Directors for the Utility Variable-Generation Integration Group (UVIG).
- 13 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 14 A. Yes.

⁵ http://www.vestas.com/en/wind-power-plants/operation-and-service/service.aspx#/vestas-univers.