

Issued: March 12, 2008

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

DR 10, UE 88, and UM 989  
Phase III

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)	)	CONFERENCE REPORT
Portland General Electric Company's Application for an Accounting Order and for Order Approving Tariff Sheets Implementing Rate Reduction. (UM 989)	)	

**DISPOSITION: PHASE III SCHEDULE ESTABLISHED**

On March 12, 2008, a status conference was held to establish a procedural schedule for Phase III of these remand proceedings. Daniel Meek appeared on behalf of the Utility Reform Project (URP), Lloyd Marbet, Colleen O'Neil, and Linda Williams (collectively URP); David White and Paul Conable appeared on behalf of Portland General Electric Company (PGE); Stephanie Andrus appeared on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon.

At the conference, the parties indicated that they had reached agreement on the following schedule:

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>DATE</b>
PGE Opening Testimony	April 11, 2008 <sup>1</sup>
Staff & URP/CAP Response Testimony	May 16, 2008
All parties file rebuttal testimony	June 13, 2008 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Beginning on this date, parties will make a good-faith effort to respond to data requests within seven calendar days.

<sup>2</sup> Three-business-day turnaround for all data requests PGE issues for response from Staff or URP/CAP from this date until PGE's surrebuttal testimony.

PGE Surrebuttal Testimony	June 27, 2008 <sup>3</sup>
Hearing	July 10, 2008
Simultaneous Opening Briefs	July 21, 2008
Simultaneous Reply Briefs	July 31, 2008
PGE Reply Brief	August 11, 2008
Commission Order	September 12, 2008

URP stated that it fully supported the schedule, but indicated that its expert witness would be out of the country during an extended period of time in May that might necessitate some scheduling changes. For this reason, URP reserved the right to seek an amendment to the schedule to address the availability of its witness.

The proposed schedule is adopted. For the parties' convenience, the list of issues to be addressed in Phase III is attached. The parties' testimony and argument should be organized consistent with this list.

Dated this 12th day of March, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Grant  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Wallace  
Administrative Law Judge

<sup>3</sup> Three-business day turnaround for all data requests Staff or URP/CAP issue for response from PGE from this date until the hearing.

**DR 10, UE 88, UM 989**  
**Phase III Issue List**

- Issue 1: What was PGE's remaining undepreciated investment in Trojan as of October 1, 2000?
- Issue 2: Do the rates approved in Order No. 02-227 provide PGE with the functional equivalent of a "return on" the remaining undepreciated investment in Trojan?
- Issue 3: Was the FAS 109 liability properly considered part of PGE's return of its Trojan investment?
- Issue 4: Did the rates approved in Order No. 02-227 improperly transfer the proceeds and/or premium refunds from PGE's NEIL policy from ratepayers to PGE?
- Issue 5: Were the rates approved in Order No. 02-227 just and reasonable?
- Issue 6: Was Order No. 02-227 supported by adequate findings of fact and conclusions of law?
- Issue 7: Did the Commission deny URP due process in docket UM 989?