

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UE 196

In the Matter of)	
)	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY)	BENCH REQUEST
)	
Application to Amortize the Boardman Deferral.)	

After a review of the record in the above-captioned docket, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon has determined that there is insufficient information to determine whether Portland General Electric Company (PGE) was prudent in the installation and maintenance of the upgraded LP1 turbine at the Boardman generating facility. PGE is therefore ordered to provide responses, including supporting documentation, to the following questions within 20 calendar days:

1. PGE states that it relied exclusively on Siemens, the original equipment manufacturer, for the installation and maintenance of the upgraded LP1 turbine. *See, e.g.,* PGE/300, Quennoz/13.
 - a. What is standard industry practice for turbine installation and maintenance?
 - b. Provide examples of other utilities that have relied on an original equipment manufacturer to provide such services.
 - c. Provide examples of other instances in which Siemens has provided such services to PGE and other utilities.
2. Provide copies of the Siemens reports provided in response to the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU) Data Request Nos. 009, 010, 016, and 018. *See* ICNU/105, Martin/1.
3. Other than Siemens, what entities provide turbine installation or maintenance?
4. Is it standard industry practice for a utility to rely exclusively on an outside entity's (including an original equipment manufacturer) quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) program for the installation and maintenance of a turbine rotor instead of having its own QA/QC program? *See, e.g.,* ICNU/105, Martin/1.

- a. Describe the key elements of Siemens's QA/QC program.
 - b. Provide examples of other instances where PGE and other utilities have relied exclusively on an outside entity's QA/QC program for installation and maintenance services.
5. Describe in detail the actions PGE personnel took to oversee the installation and maintenance work performed by Siemens on the LP1 turbine. *See, e.g., PGE/400, Quennoz/10.*
- a. Identify the PGE personnel responsible for overseeing Siemens's installation and maintenance of the LP1 turbine and describe their experience, training, education, and specialized knowledge.
 - b. How could PGE provide effective oversight if much of the information about the installation of the new rotors in the LP1 turbine was considered proprietary and not shared with PGE? *See, e.g., PGE/105C-A, Quennoz/4-5.*
6. Did PGE hire any outside consultants to oversee, monitor, or examine Siemens's installation and maintenance? If so, provide any reports or other similar materials prepared by these outside consultants.
7. Provide any reports or other similar materials prepared by the contractor hired in 2006 to perform the "frame foot loading test" referenced in ICNU/312C at 4.
8. Provide any reports or other similar materials prepared by the consultant(s) hired to conduct alignment checks and measure turbine component movement. *See PGE/300, Quennoz/3, lines 14-15.*

The record in this docket is re-opened to allow the addition of PGE's responses to these questions. Other parties will be given the opportunity to submit testimony regarding the information produced in response. A prehearing conference will be scheduled to determine the scope of additional proceedings and to set a procedural schedule.

Dated this 8th day of December, 2008 at Salem, Oregon.

Sarah K. Wallace
Administrative Law Judge