

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UM 1147

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF	)	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
OREGON	)	MEMORANDUM
	)	
Staff Request to Open an Investigation	)	
Related to Deferred Accounting.	)	
	)	

On January 24, 2006, a prehearing conference was held in this docket. The primary purpose of the conference was to establish a procedural schedule for the second phase of this proceeding.

**Appearances**

Appearances were entered as follows: Stephanie Andrus appeared on behalf of Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon; Sarah Adams Lien appeared on behalf of PacifiCorp; and Edward A. Finklea appeared on behalf of Northwest Industrial Gas Users. In addition, the following appeared by telephone: David White, on behalf of Portland General Electric Company; Matthew Perkins, on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities; Kevin McVay, on behalf of Northwest Natural; and Barton Kline, on behalf of Idaho Power Company.

**Procedural Schedule**

In Order No. 05-1070 adopting deferred accounting principles, the Commission indicated that further investigation was warranted regarding whether the Commission's existing policy, of applying an interest rate to deferred accounts that is equal to the utility's authorized rate of return, should be modified. Consequently, the Commission authorized a second phase in the above captioned docket to specifically address the following questions: 1) whether a different rate of interest should be applied to authorized deferred accounts during amortization; 2) if so, what that rate should be; and 3) how it would be applied to deferred accounts that are currently accruing prospective deferrals and accounts under the provisions of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980.

Parties agreed to further phase this docket in order to address only the first question in this second phase. Following a Commission order regarding whether a different rate of interest should be applied to authorized deferred accounts during amortization, parties agreed that a subsequent phase can be undertaken, if necessary, to address how the different rate should be determined, and how it should be applied.

Parties agreed to, and I adopted, the following procedural schedule for the second phase:

Simultaneous opening comments due	March 16, 2006
Simultaneous reply comments due	April 21, 2006
Oral argument may be requested	TBD

The dates for filing are considered “in hand” dates.

Dated this 25th day of January, 2006, at Salem, Oregon.

---

**Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick**  
Administrative Law Judge