

**From:** [GRANT Michael](#)  
**To:** ["Greg Adams"](#)  
**Cc:** [Keil Mueller](#); [Rob Shlachter](#); [Jeff Lovinger \(jeff@lovingerlaw.com\)](#); [David White](#); [Dallas DeLuca](#); [MENZA Candice](#)  
**Subject:** RE: UM 1931 Procedural Schedule - Deadline for Answer/Motion to Dismiss  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2018 1:59:36 PM

---

Mr. Adams,

This email serves to confirm that the third motion, which sought expedited consideration of the first two motions and was supported by PGE, is granted in its entirety.

**Michael Grant**

Chief Administrative Law Judge  
Public Utility Commission of Oregon Public Utility Commission  
(503) 378-6102

---

**From:** Greg Adams [mailto:Greg@richardsonadams.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 7, 2018 1:56 PM  
**To:** GRANT Michael <mgrant@puc.state.or.us>  
**Cc:** Keil Mueller <KM Mueller@stollberne.com>; Rob Shlachter <RShlachter@stollberne.com>; Jeff Lovinger (jeff@lovingerlaw.com) <jeff@lovingerlaw.com>; David White <David.White@pgn.com>; Dallas DeLuca <dallasdeluca@markowitzherbold.com>  
**Subject:** UM 1931 Procedural Schedule - Deadline for Answer/Motion to Dismiss

Judge Grant,

On behalf of the NewSun QFs (defendants) in this matter, we would like to clarify if the ruling on Monday, February 5, 2018, granted the entirety of the NewSun QFs' unopposed procedural motion, including the request that the due date for the answer and/or motion to dismiss was extended from February 15, 2018 to February 22, 2018. That was the motion titled –

**“DEFENDANTS’ UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDING AND TO EXTEND TIME TO ANSWER THE COMPLAINT”**

We had reached agreement with PGE on the proposed procedure in that motion to process the stay motion as reasonably as possible. Building in the extra week extension on the due date for the answer and/or motion to dismiss was intended to provide a more orderly processing of the motion for stay and allow a ruling on that motion for stay within reasonable time in advance of when the answer and/or motion to dismiss would have to be filed if the stay were denied.

The ruling states it granted the “motion for expedited consideration,” which would have included the new due date for the answer/motion to dismiss of February 22, 2018. However, the docket page on the Commission’s website still has February 15, 2018 as the deadline for the answer, and the ruling itself is a little unclear on the point since it only specifically calls

out the due date for PGE's response on February 9, 2018.

We'd like to make sure everyone has the same understanding as to the procedural schedule.

If you would like us to make a formal motion for clarification or to discuss this further on a phone call, we can of course accommodate either course of action.

Thanks in advance for your help on this issue.

Greg Adams  
Richardson Adams, PLLC  
515 N. 27th Street, 83702  
P.O. Box 7218, 83707  
Boise, Idaho  
Voice: 208.938.2236  
Facsimile: 208.938.7904

Information contained in this electronic message and in any attachments hereto may contain information that is confidential, protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Inadvertent disclosure of the contents of this email or its attachments to unintended recipients is not intended to and does not constitute a waiver of the attorney/client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender of the erroneous receipt and destroy this email and any attachments of the same either electronic or printed. Thank you.

**\*\*\*Please use caution when opening links, attachments or responding to this email as it originated outside of PUC.\*\*\***