

900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600 Portland, Oregon 97204 main 503.224.3380 fax 503.220.2480 www.stoel.com

November 7, 2005

KATHERINE A. McDowell Direct (503) 294-9602 kamcdowell@stoel.com

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

PUC Filing Center Public Utility Commission of Oregon PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148

Re: MEHC's and PacifiCorp's Response to CUB's Motion to Modify the Schedule

Docket UM 1209

Enclosed for filing please find MEHC's and PacifiCorp's to Response to CUB's Motion to Modify the Schedule in the above-referenced docket. A copy of this filing has been served on all parties to this proceeding as indicated on the attached certificate of service.

Very truly yours,

Katherine A. McDowell

KAM:knp Enclosure

cc: Service List

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION 1 OF OREGON 2 UM 1209 3 4 In the Matter of MIDAMERICAN MEHC's AND PACIFICORP's ENERGY HOLDINGS COMPANY **RESPONSE TO CUB'S MOTION TO** Application for Authorization to Acquire MODIFY THE SCHEDULE Pacific Power & Light, dba PacifiCorp. 6 7 MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company ("MEHC") and PacifiCorp (collectively, 8 the "Filing Parties") provide the following response to the Citizens' Utility Board ("CUB") 9 of Oregon's Motion to Modify the Schedule. 10 1. The Filing Parties' basic position on the schedule has not changed from that 11 stated in response to the previous motion to change the schedule: "As a general matter, the 12 Filing Parties can support any reasonable procedural schedule that results in a Commission 13 order by the end of the suspension period of February 28, 2006. The Filing Parties believe 14 that a reasonable procedural schedule is one that accommodates the needs of the Commission 15 to develop an orderly and complete record and the needs of Staff and Intervenors to 16 constructively and fully respond to the Application. The Filing Parties believe that the schedule contained in the ALJ's August 4, 2005 Ruling ("August 4 Ruling") meets these goals." See MEHC's and PacifiCorp's Response to Joint Motion for Certification (August 19 18, 2005). 20 2. CUB's basis for its Motion to Modify the Schedule is its desire to add a round 21 of surrebuttal testimony to the schedule to permit Staff and Intervenors "a full opportunity to 22 respond to Applicant's rebuttal of their testimony." CUB Motion at 2. While the Filing Parties do not agree that CUB's concerns are warranted, they do not object to changes in the current design of the schedule as set forth below and as long as the resulting schedule permits 25 an order before the end of the February 28, 2006 suspension period in this case. 26

Page 1 - MEHC's AND PACIFICORP's RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION

- 1 3. The Filing Parties would agree to either of the following alternative
- 2 scheduling proposals to respond to CUB's concerns:
- 3 Alternative One

Staff/Intervenor Testimony	November 21 (no change)
----------------------------	-------------------------

- Filing Parties' Rebuttal December 5
 Staff/Intervenor Surrebuttal December 19
 Executive Summaries December 23
- 6 Hearing (with Sursurrebuttal if needed) January 4-6 (no change)
- 7 Alternative Two

	Filing Parties' Supplemental Direct	November 18
8	Staff/Intervenor Testimony	December 5
Q	All Party Rebuttal	December 19
9	Executive Summaries	December 23

- Hearing January 4-6 (no change)
- 11 4. The Filing Parties object to the proposed schedule in CUB's Motion for a
- 12 number of reasons, the first one being that it proposes hearing dates of January 24-25, 2006,
- 13 which conflict with the hearings in Wyoming now scheduled in this matter. Moving the
- 14 hearing from its current date to another date in January is problematic because of the
- 15 following scheduling conflicts:

16	PacifiCorp's Washington GRC	January 9-20
17	Idaho Hearings	January 17-18
	Wyoming Hearings	January 23-26

- 18 The Filing Parties could agree to an alternative hearing date during the Washington GRC
- 19 (with some acceleration of the briefing schedule), but they are sensitive to the concerns of
- 20 ICNU who is a participant in both that case and this one. Scheduling the Oregon hearing
- 21 toward the end of the Washington GRC hearing, however, may minimize this conflict.
- The Filing Parties also object to CUB's proposed schedule because it
- 23 contemplates that Staff and Intervenors have the final round of testimony (while CUB refers
- 24 to its proposed surrebuttal testimony as "All-Party," this is inaccurate because the surrebuttal
- will be directed at the Filing Parties' rebuttal). As the parties with the burden of proof, the
- Page 2 MEHC's AND PACIFICORP's RESPONSE TO CUB's MOTION TO MODIFY THE SCHEDULE

- 1 Filing Parties are entitled to the final responsive round of testimony in this case. See 860-
- 2 014-0035(1)(c) (order of evidence on applications ends with rebuttal by applicant). While
- 3 the Filing Parties are willing to forego written sur-surrebuttal and present responsive
- 4 testimony at the hearing, it is improper to simply eliminate the Filing Parties' last round of
- 5 testimony.
- 6. While the Filing Parties are willing to make significant scheduling
- 7 accommodations to respond to the concerns of CUB (and the other parties who have joined
- 8 the motion), they do not agree that the current schedule impedes development of an
- 9 appropriate record in this case. Indeed, in setting this schedule, the Commission indicated
- 10 that the schedule was designed to "serve the needs of the Commission to develop a sound
- 11 factual record and arguments in a timely fashion." In re MidAmerican Energy Holdings
- 12 Company, Ruling (August 5, 2005). In rejecting the motion that followed to change the
- 13 schedule, the Commission explained that, based upon lessons learned from UM 1121 and
- 14 other cases, it had specifically adopted a "schedule designed to be more efficient and
- 15 effective." In re MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company, Order 05-970 at 3 (August 31,
- 16 2005).
- 7. Nothing has occurred in this case that demonstrates that the current schedule
- 18 is inadequate. While CUB now complains that MEHC's Supplemental Testimony was
- 19 narrow in scope, this was always contemplated. See id at 2 (accepting MEHC's "assertion
- 20 that its Supplemental Direct Testimony will be narrow in scope.") CUB also points to Mr.
- 21 Abel's statement at the Commission public meeting that the MEHC Application was
- 22 "deficient." As Mr. Abel explained at the meeting, the only deficiency he meant to
- 23 acknowledge was the Filing Parties' inability to precisely predict which issues the parties to
- 24 this case would focus on and which they would like to see developed in greater detail. The
- 25 specific issue to which Mr. Abel referred at the public meeting—the rate impacts of MEHC's
- 26 investment commitments and whether they provide a benefit net of their costs—was

Page 3 - MEHC's AND PACIFICORP's RESPONSE TO CUB's MOTION TO MODIFY THE SCHEDULE

1	addressed in the Application in the testimony of Messrs. Abel and Gale. The issue raised by		
2	the Commission in its questions, the anticipated duration and nature of ScottishPower's		
3	continued ownership of PacifiCorp, was addressed in the testimony of Ms. Johansen. To the		
4	extent that Staff and Intervenors plan to raise additional concerns about these issues in their		
5	testimony, the Filing Parties will provide appropriate responsive comments.		
6	For all the foregoing reasons, the Filing Parties respectfully request that the		
7	Commission deny the schedule change proposed by CUB and either adhere to the present		
8	schedule or modify it in a manner proposed by the Filing Parties above which still permits		
9	the Commission Order in this case to issue before the end of the February 28, 2006		
10	suspension period in this case.		
11			
12	DATED: November 7, 2005. STOEL RIVES		
13	STOEL RIVESSEE		
14			
15	Katherine A. McDowell		
16	Attorneys for MEHC and PacifiCorp		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Page 4 - MEHC's AND PACIFICORP's RESPONSE TO CUB's MOTION TO MODIFY THE SCHEDULE

26

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	I hereby certify that I served the foregoing document in docket UM 1209 on the		
3	following named person(s) on the date indicated below by		
4	mailing with postage prepaid		
5	☐ hand delivery		
6	☐ facsimile transmission		
7	Electronic mail		
8	to said person(s) a true copy thereof, contained in a sealed envelope, addressed to said		
9	person(s) at his or her last-known address(es) indicated below.		
10	NW Energy Coalition	Rates & Regulatory Affairs	
11	219 First Street, Suite 100 Seattle, WA 98104	Portland General Electric 121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC0702	
12		Portland, OR 97204 pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	
13	Adam S. Arms	Utility Workers Union of America	
14	aarms@mbjlaw.com	PO Box 37	
15		San Clemente, CA 92674-0037 uwua@redhabanero.com	
16	Jim Abrahamson	Douglas L. Anderson	
17	Community Action Directors of Or 4035 12 th Street Cutoff SE, Suite 11	MidAmerican Energy Holdings Co 302 S 36 Street, Suite 400	
18	Salem, OR 97302	Omaha, NE 68131	
19	jim@cado-oregon.org	gerickson@midamerican.com	
20	Edward Bartell Klamath Off-Project Water Users, l	Curtis G. Berkey nc. Alexander Berkey Williams	
21	30474 Sprague River Road Sprague River, OR 97639	& Weathers 2000 Center Street, Suite 308	
22	F0, 0,	Berkey, CA 94704 cberkey@abwwlaw.com	
23	Magaia Duile		
24	Maggie Brilz Idaho Power Company	Lowrey R. Brown Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon	
	PO Box 70	610 SW Broadway Suite 308	

610 SW Broadway, Suite 308

Portland, OR 97205

lowrey@oregoncub.org

Page 1 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UM 1209)

PO Box 70

Boise, ID 83707-0070

mbrilz@idahopower.com

25

26

Page 2 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UM 1209)

STOEL RIVES LLP

Page 3 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UM 1209)

Page 4 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UM 1209)

	1 2 3	Linda K. Williams Kafoury & McDougal 10266 SW Lancaster Road Portland, OR 97219-6305 linda@lindawilliams.net	Michael W. Orcutt Hoopa Valley Tribe Fisheries Dept PO Box 417 Hoopa, CA 95546 director@pcweb.net
	4 5	Peter J. Richardson Richardson & O'Leary	Paul Woodin Western Wind Power
	6 7	PO Box 7218 Boise, ID 83707 peter@richardsonandoleary.com	282 Largent Lane Goldendale, WA 98620-3619 pwoodin@gorge.net
	8	DATED: November 7, 2005.	
STOEL RIVES LLP 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600, Portland, OR 97204 <i>Main</i> (503) 224-3380 Fax (503) 220-2480	9		
	10		
d, OR 20-24	11		Katherine A. McDowell
LLP Portlan '503) 2	12		Of Attorneys for MEHC and PacifiCorp
VES 2600,] Fax (13		
EL R. Suite 3380	14		
STOEL RIVES LLP INVESTUR INVENTE INVESTUR S 1 224-3380 Eax (503)	15		
Fifth ∆ in (503	16		
00 SW Ma	17		
8	18		
	19		
	20		
	21	•	
	22		
	23		

Page 5 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UM 1209)

24

25

26