



February 19, 2009

TO: Melinda Davison  
Industrial Customers of NW Utilities

FROM: Patrick G. Hager  
Manager, Regulatory Affairs

**PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC  
UE 196  
PGE Response to ICNU Data Request 13.15  
Dated February 5, 2009  
Question No. 111**

**Request:**

**Please provide a copy of all hand written Job Notes for the installation of the HP/IP turbine in 2004. Also, please identify references to the “witness points” that PGE inspected during the installation of the HP/IP turbine.**

**Response:**

PGE objects to this request because it is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving its objections, PGE responds as follows:

PGE negotiated the contractual right to establish “witness points” during the HP/IP manufacturing process. (See Article 14, Inspection, on Page 7 of the HP/IP upgrade contract, provided as Attachment 096-A to PGE’s Response to ICNU Data Request No. 096.) Siemens performed the manufacturing for the HP/IP upgrade at its facilities in Germany and the eastern United States. These “witness points” required advance notification and gave PGE the ability to observe and accept important steps in the manufacturing process.

It was not necessary for PGE to negotiate a specific list of “witness points” for the installation phase of the HP/IP upgrade because installation took place at the Boardman facility and PGE’s project manager, Janet Kahl (née Gulley), and other PGE personnel were present at the Boardman site to monitor the entire installation. Their monitoring was not limited to a specific list of “witness points.”

February 19, 2009

Page 2

PGE oversight of the HP/IP installation was similar to PGE oversight of the LP installation. However, Janet Kahl (who was project manager for both upgrades) did not retain job notes from the HP/IP upgrade. We have also not located any hand written diaries or other reference materials from the installation phase of the HP/IP upgrade.

g:\ratecase\opuc\dockets\ue-196\dr-in\icnu\_pge\finals\dr\_111.doc

February 19, 2009

TO: Melinda Davison  
Industrial Customers of NW Utilities

FROM: Patrick G. Hager  
Manager, Regulatory Affairs

**PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC  
UE 196  
PGE Response to ICNU Data Request 13.11  
Dated February 5, 2009  
Question No. 107**

**Request:**

**The last paragraph of UE 196/PGE Exhibit 517C/21/Quennoz/5 indicates that only one bolt was loosened at a time during the frame foot test. Please explain why. Did PGE want to duplicate the loose and miss [sic] fasteners that that were discovered in 2006 to determine the possible degree of movement that would have been produced? If not, why not?**

**Response:**

In order to determine if a "soft foot" condition existed, we chose a contractor, Sensoplan, who specializes in this type of analysis. Sensoplan followed its own protocols in performing the "soft foot" analysis. These protocols included loosening only one bolt at a time.