
From: Williams, Rich [mailto:WilliamsR@LanePowell.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2007 4:14 PM
To: POWER Patrick J.; Anderson, Diane M. (Perkins Coie); PUC.FilingCenter
Cc: GRAHAM Paul; natalie.hocken@pacificorp.com; Petranovich, Milo; Van Nostrand, James M. (Perkins Coie); Aldisert, Robert (Perkins Coie); Garrett, Christopher L. (Perkins Coie)
Subject: RE: Wah Chang v. PacifiCorp / UM 1002 / Letter to ALJ Patrick Power / Van Nostrand

Dear Judge Power:

This responds to Mr. Van Nostrand's letter this date and your e-mail message below.

Wah Chang does not agree to the schedule proposed by Mr. Van Nostrand because it is unnecessarily hurried. For example, it would require Wah Chang and its experts to review the sur-rebuttal testimony, and write and serve data requests, all on the day (July 31) immediately before the hearing, thus distracting them from hearing preparation. Also, Wah Chang does not agree with Mr. Van Nostrand's suggestion that only one hearing day likely will be needed for all matters other than the sur-rebuttal testimony.

Wah Chang does not believe it is unduly burdensome for Dr. Cicchetti to appear twice, once for cross-examination on his reply testimony and again for cross-examination on his sur-rebuttal testimony at a date later in August or September.

However, if Dr. Cicchetti will be required to appear only once, Wah Chang suggests the following: (1) sur-rebuttal testimony filed on Monday, July 30; (2) Wah Chang's data requests served on Thursday, August 2; (3) responses served on Monday, August 6; (4) cross-examination of Dr. Cicchetti on Wednesday, August 8.

Respectfully,

Richard H. Williams
Lane Powell PC
601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2100
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 778-2160 (direct)
(503) 778-2200 (fax)
williamsr@lanepowell.com