

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

UM 1818

COLUMBIA BASIN ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE, INC. an Oregon
cooperative corporation

Complainant,

v.

UMATILLA ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE, INC., an Oregon
cooperative corporation

Defendant.

ARGUMENTS OF GREG TE VELDE IN
SUPPORT OF UMATILLA ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE’S MOTION TO
BIFURCATE

Greg te Velde, dba Willow Creek Dairy (“te Velde”), submits the following arguments in support of the Motion to Bifurcate of Umatilla Electric Cooperative, Inc. (“UEC”):

1.

te Velde agrees with the arguments in support of bifurcation stated by UEC in its motion.

2.

While counsel for Columbia Basin Electric Cooperative, Inc. (“Columbia Basin”) indicates in his response to the motion that the issues in the Wheatridge Project and te Velde cases are related, he cites no facts to support that assertion, and neither are any such facts alleged in the Complaint.

3.

te Velde, as an interested party, would like to see this matter resolved expeditiously. Counsel for Columbia Basin, in his arguments at the telephone conference on February 28, 2017, requested a fall hearing date for this entire matter, based upon his stated need to do extensive discovery on issues related to the Wheatridge Project. As explained in more detail in

1 the Motion to Bifurcate of UEC, the Wheatridge Project issues, which involve a dispute over a
2 large wind energy project transmission line, are entirely unrelated to the te Velde issues, which
3 are relatively simple, and relate to the question whether, given that a small portion of his 7,300
4 acre ranch lies within the Columbia Basin Service area, te Velde should be allowed to receive all
5 of his electric service from UEC. If Columbia Basin is successful, this will have an economic
6 impact on te Velde and his operations, and he would like to see this matter resolved separately,
7 and expeditiously.

8 3.

9 te Velde is considering intervening in this matter. Whether or not the case is bifurcated will
10 have a bearing on that decision, since, if the case is not bifurcated, he would likely not wish to
11 intervene, given the extensive nature and complexity of the issues involving the Wheatridge
12 Project portion of the case, in which he has no interest.

13 CONCLUSION

14 For the reasons stated above, the Motion to Bifurcate of UEC should be allowed.

15
16 DATED this 3rd day of March, 2017.

17 COLLINS & COLLINS, LLP

18
19 By Michael B. Collins
20 Michael B. Collins, OSB#801951
21 of Attorneys for Greg te Velde
22
23
24