

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

DR 10, UE 88, UM 989

In the Matters of )  
 )  
 The Application of Portland General Electric )  
 Company for an Investigation into Least Cost )  
 Plan Plant Retirement, (DR 10) )  
 )  
 Revised Tariffs Schedules for Electric )  
 Service in Oregon Filed by Portland General )  
 Electric Company, (UE 88) )  
 )  
 Portland General Electric Company's )  
 Application for an Accounting Order and for )  
 Order Approving Tariff Sheets Implementing )  
 Rate Reduction. (UM 989) )

CONSOLIDATED PROCEDURAL  
CONFERENCE  
MEMORANDUM

On April 27, 2004, a consolidated procedural conference was held in Salem, Oregon. The purpose of the procedural conference was to further address issues raised regarding the scope of, and schedule for, proceedings necessary to comply with separate orders from the Marion County Circuit Court remanding the three dockets referenced above.

Appearances were entered as follows: Jason Jones, attorney, appeared on behalf of Commission Staff; Jay Dudley, attorney, appeared on behalf of Portland General Electric Company (PGE); David White, attorney, also appeared on behalf of PGE; Jeanne M. Chamberlain additionally appeared on behalf of PGE; Dan Meek, attorney, appeared on behalf of the Utility Reform Project and other parties previously represented in the dockets (URP).

I addressed the petition to intervene of three PGE customers: Kafoury Bros., LLC, Frank Gearhart and Patricia Morgan. An original version of the petition to intervene was filed with the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission) on March 31, 2004, and a corrected version of the petition was filed on April 16, 2004. In the Consolidated Procedural Conference Memorandum, dated April 1, 2004, I requested that parties address the petition to intervene in opening and reply memorandums, indicating that I would not rule on the petition until after submission of all comments. Having received no objections to the petition to intervene, and based on review of the

information in the petition to intervene, I found that the petitioners meet the requirements to be intervenors pursuant to OAR 860-013-0021. The petition to intervene is granted.

The Proposed Electronic Service Protocol, filed by URP on April 26, 2004, was also addressed. Explaining that the Commission does not have rules regarding electronic service, I indicated that the Commission would not require the parties to commit to electronic service on the parties. The procedural conference participants agreed, however, to work collaboratively towards a final protocol that parties may voluntarily agree to abide by.

Procedural conference participants were unable to reach agreement regarding the scope of, issues and schedule for the proceeding, but elaborated on their positions with regard to these matters. I indicated that I would take parties' positions presented in the memorandums and at the procedural conference under advisement. A ruling will be separately issued regarding the scope of, issues and schedule for the proceeding.

URP asked whether the consolidated service list for the above dockets was finalized. As of this date, the official service list has been revised and should be used on a going-forward basis.

Dated this 28th day of April, 2004, at Salem, Oregon.

---

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick  
Administrative Law Judge