

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UE 165

In the Matter of)	
)	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC)	RULING
)	
Application for a Hydro Generation Power)	
Cost Adjustment Mechanism.)	

DISPOSITION: MOTION TO AMEND SCHEDULE GRANTED

On March 7, 2005, Portland General Electric (PGE) filed a new motion to amend the procedural schedule in this proceeding (Motion). PGE requested expedited treatment of the Motion, asking that a ruling be issued prior to the current due date for PGE Rebuttal Testimony. Rebuttal Testimony by PGE is currently due on March 15, 2005.

On behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU), PGE requests an opportunity for intervenors to respond to testimony submitted by Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission), which necessitates a later due date for PGE Rebuttal Testimony. PGE also represents that, depending on the nature of PGE's Rebuttal Testimony, parties may desire additional rounds of testimony. PGE, therefore, requests that a prehearing conference be scheduled after PGE's Rebuttal Testimony is submitted, to address future schedule changes.

PGE, Staff, ICNU and the Citizens' Utility Board agree to the following revised schedule:

EVENT	CURRENT DUE DATE	REVISED DUE DATE
ICNU (and CUB if it desires) files Rebuttal Testimony		March 15, 2005
PGE files Rebuttal Testimony	March 15, 2005	March 30, 2005
Prehearing Conference		April 4, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. ¹
Hearing	April 19, 2005	No change requested at this time

¹ The parties requested that a prehearing conference be held on April 7, 2005, or another date depending on my availability. Although I am available on April 7, 2005, a hearing room is not. Consequently, I have scheduled the prehearing conference for April 4, 2005, at 1:30 p.m.

I note, again, that the procedural schedule, as currently established and as proposed, will extend beyond the second suspension period for this docket. PGE has either proposed, or supported, all of the modifications to this docket's schedule and agrees that an additional extension beyond the second suspension is appropriate. Consequently, PGE has again indicated, pursuant to ORS 757.215(2), that it will file a letter agreeing to an extension of the suspension of this docket. The extension period should be sufficient to allow for an equal amount of time as originally scheduled between the hearing and the end of the suspension. The amount of additional time needed cannot be fully known, however, until after the hearing and briefing schedule is finally established in this proceeding.

Based on PGE's representation that all parties agree to the proposed schedule, I grant the Motion and approve the modified schedule set forth above with the understanding that PGE will address an extension of the suspension period for this docket no later than the end of this month, and that PGE will subsequently agree to lengthen the extension as necessary to accommodate future changes to the schedule. Should PGE have a different understanding, PGE should file a responsive motion to this ruling immediately.

Dated this 9th day of March, 2005, at Salem, Oregon.

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick
Administrative Law Judge