Davison Van Cleve PC

TEL (503) 241-7242 • FAX (503) 241-8160 • mail@dvclaw.com

Suite 2460 1000 SW Broadway Portland, OR 97205

July 23, 2004

Via Facsimile, Electronically, and U.S. Mail

Ms. Cheryl Walker Oregon Public Utility Commission P.O. Box 2148 Salem OR 97308-2148

Re: In the Matter of Oregon Electric Utility Company, LLC, et al., Application for

Authorization to Acquire Portland General Electric Company

Docket No. UM 1121

Dear Ms. Walker:

Enclosed please find an original and six copies of the Application for Partial Reconsideration and Clarification of Commission Order No. 04-352 and ALJ Logan's Ruling Clarifying Order on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities, Citizens' Utility Board, and Associated Oregon Industries in the above-captioned Docket.

Please return one file-stamped copy of the document in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Christian W. Griffen

Enclosures

cc: Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served the foregoing Application for Partial Reconsideration and Clarification of Commission Order No. 04-352 and ALJ Logan's Ruling Clarifying Order on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities, Citizens' Utility Board, and Associated Oregon Industries upon the parties, shown below, on the official service list for Docket No. UM 1121, by causing the same to be electronically served on all parties whom have an email address on the official service list, and by U.S. Mail, postage-prepaid, to those parties who do not have an email address on the official service list.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 23rd day of July, 2004.

Christian W. Griffen

JIM ABRAHAMSON COMMUNITY ACTION DIRECTORS OF OREGON 4035 12TH ST CUTOFF SE STE 110 SALEM OR 97302 jim@cado-oregon.org	SUSAN K ACKERMAN NIPPC PO BOX 10207 PORTLAND OR 97296-0207 susan.k.ackerman@comcast.net
GRIEG ANDERSON 5919 W MILES ST. PORTLAND OR 97219	KEN BEESON EUGENE WATER & ELECTRIC BOARD 500 EAST FOURTH AVENUE EUGENE OR 97440-2148 ken.beeson@eweb.eugene.or.us
JULIE BRANDIS ASSOCIATED OREGON INDUSTRIES 1149 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4030 jbrandis@aoi.org	MIKE BROSCH UTILITECH 740 NORTHWEST BLUE PARKWAY STE 204 LEE'S SUMMIT MO 64086 mbrosch@utilitech.net
KIM BURT WEST LINN PAPER COMPANY 4800 MILL ST WEST LINN OR 97068 kburt@wlinpco.com	J LAURENCE CABLE CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT ET AL 1001 SW 5TH AVE STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97204-1136 Icable@chbh.com
MICHAEL CARUSO 176 SW HEMLOCK DUNDEE OR 97115 carusodad@hotmail.com	JENNIFER CHAMBERLIN STRATEGIC ENERGY LLC 2633 WELLINGTON COURT CLYDE CA 94520 jchamberlin@sel.com

WILLIAM H CHEN CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY INC 2175 N CALIFORNIA BLVD STE 300 WALNUT CREEK CA 94596 bill.chen@constellation.com	JOAN COTE OREGON ENERGY COORDINATORS ASSOCIATION 2585 STATE ST NE SALEM OR 97301 cotej@mwvcaa.org
CHRIS CREAN MULTNOMAH COUNTY 501 SE HAWTHORNE, SUITE 500 PORTLAND OR 97214 christopher.d.crean@co.multnomah.or.us	MELINDA J DAVISON DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC 1000 SW BROADWAY STE 2460 PORTLAND OR 97205 mail@dvclaw.com
JIM DEASON CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT HAAGENSEN & LLOYD LLP 1001 SW FIFTH AVE STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97204-1136 jdeason@chbh.com	J JEFFREY DUDLEY PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC 121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC1301 PORTLAND OR 97204 jay_dudley@pgn.com
GARY DUELL 11301 SE CHARVIEW COURT CLACKAMAS, OR OR 97015 gduell@bigplanet.com	JASON EISDORFER CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON 610 SW BROADWAY STE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205 jason@oregoncub.org
JAMES F FELL STOEL RIVES LLP 900 SW 5TH AVE STE 2600 PORTLAND OR 97204-1268 jffell@stoel.com	ANN L FISHER AF LEGAL & CONSULTING SERVICES 1425 SW 20TH STE 202 PORTLAND OR 97201 energlaw@aol.com
ANDREA FOGUE LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES PO BOX 928 1201 COURT ST NE STE 200 SALEM OR 97308 afogue@orcities.org	SCOTT FORRESTER FRIENDS OF THE CLACKAMAS RIVER 2030 NE 7TH PL GRESHAM OR 97030 clackamas9@aol.com
KATHERINE FUTORNICK 14800 NE BLUEBIRD HILL LANE DAYTON OR 97114 futork@onlinemac.com	LORA GARLAND L-7 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION P.O. BOX 3621 PORTLAND OR 97208-3621 Imgarland@bpa.gov
LEONARD GIRARD 2169 SW KINGS COURT PORTLAND OR 97205 Igirard@teleport.com	ANN ENGLISH GRAVATT RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT 917 SW OAK - STE 303 PORTLAND OR 97205 ann@rnp.org
PATRICK G HAGER PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC 121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC0702 PORTLAND OR 97204 patrick_hager@pgn.com	ROY HENDERSON PENSION ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE 895 NW DALE AVENUE PORTLAND OR 97229 royhensn@msn.com

MARY ANN HUTTON CANON AND HUTTON 9999 NE WORDEN HILL RD DUNDEE OR 97115-9147 mah@canonandhutton.com	JOE JANSSENS PGE PENSION ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE 24495 BUTTEVILLE RD NE AURORA OR 97002 osprey64@juno.com
VALARIE KOSS COLUMBIA RIVER PUD PO BOX 1193 SAINT HELENS OR 97051 vkoss@crpud.org	GEOFFREY M KRONICK LC7 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION PO BOX 3621 PORTLAND OR 97208-3621 gmkronick@bpa.gov
MICHAEL L KURTZ BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY 36 E 7TH ST STE 2110 CINCINNATI OH 45202 mkurtzlaw@aol.com	ROCHELLE LESSNER LANE, POWELL, SPEARS, LUBERSKY LLP 601 SW 2ND AVE. STE. 2100 PORTLAND OR 97204 lessnerr@lanepowell.com
KEN LEWIS 2880 NW ARIEL TERRACE PORTLAND OR 97210 kl04@mailstation.com	STEVEN G LINS GLENDALE, CITY OF 613 E BROADWAY STE 220 GLENDALE CA 91206-4394 slins@ci.glendale.ca.us
JAMES MANION WARM SPRINGS POWER ENTERPRISES PO BOX 960 WARM SPRINGS OR 97761 j_manion@wspower.com	LLOYD K MARBET DON'T WASTE OREGON 19142 S BAKERS FERRY RD BORING OR 97009 marbet@mail.com
GORDON MCDONALD PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT 825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 800 PORTLAND OR 97232 gordon.mcdonald@pacificorp.com	DANIEL W MEEK DANIEL W MEEK ATTORNEY AT LAW 10949 SW 4TH AVE PORTLAND OR 97219 dan@meek.net
THAD MILLER OREGON ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY 222 SW COLUMBIA STREET, SUITE 1850 PORTLAND OR 97201-6618 tmiller6@optonline.com	WILLIAM MILLER IBEW 17200 NE SACRAMENTO PORTLAND OR 97230 bill@ibew125.com
CHRISTY MONSON LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES 1201 COURT ST. NE STE. 200 SALEM OR 97301 cmonson@orcities.org	MICHAEL MORGAN TONKON TORP LLP 888 SW 5TH AVE STE 1600 PORTLAND OR 97204-2099 mike@tonkon.com
FRANK NELSON 543 WILLAMETTE CT MCMINNVILLE OR 97128 fnelson@viclink.com	NANCY NEWELL 3917 NE SKIDMORE PORTLAND OR 97211 ogec2@hotmail.com
JAMES NOTEBOOM KARNOPP PETERSEN NOTEBOOM ET AL 1201 NW WALL ST STE 300 BEND OR 97701 jdn@karnopp.com	LISA F RACKNER ATER WYNNE LLP 222 SW COLUMBIA ST STE 1800 PORTLAND OR 97201-6618 Ifr@aterwynne.com

DONALD W SCHOENBECK REGULATORY & COGENERATION SERVICES INC 900 WASHINGTON ST STE 780 VANCOUVER WA 98660-3455 dws@r-c-s-inc.com	REBECCA SHERMAN HYDROPOWER REFORM COALITION 320 SW STARK STREET, SUITE 429 PORTLAND OR 97204 northwest@hydroreform.org
JOHN W STEPHENS ESLER STEPHENS & BUCKLEY 888 SW FIFTH AVE STE 700 PORTLAND OR 97204-2021 stephens@eslerstephens.com	BRETT SWIFT AMERICAN RIVERS 320 SW STARK ST, SUITE 418 PORTLAND OR 97204 bswift@amrivers.org
MITCHELL TAYLOR ENRON CORPORATION PO BOX 1188 1221 LAMAR - STE 1600 HOUSTON TX 77251-1188 mitchell.taylor@enron.com	LAURENCE TUTTLE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EQUITY 610 SW ALDER #1021 PORTLAND OR 97205 nevermined@earthlink.net
S BRADLEY VAN CLEVE DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC 1000 SW BROADWAY STE 2460 PORTLAND OR 97205 mail@dvclaw.com	BENJAMIN WALTERS CITY OF PORTAND - OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY 1221 SW 4TH AVE - RM 430 PORTLAND OR 97204 bwalters@ci.portland.or.us
MICHAEL T WEIRICH DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 michael.weirich@state.or.us	STEVEN WEISS NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION 4422 OREGON TRAIL CT NE SALEM OR 97305 steve@nwenergy.org
ROBIN WHITE PORTLAND BOMA 1211 SW 5TH AVE STE 2722-MEZZANINE PORTLAND OR 97201 rwhite@bigplanet.com	LORNE WHITTLES EPCOR MERCHANT & CAPITAL (US) INC 1161 W RIVER ST STE 250 BOISE ID 83702 Iwhittles@epcor.ca
LINDA K WILLIAMS KAFOURY & MCDOUGAL 10266 SW LANCASTER RD PORTLAND OR 97219-6305 linda@lindawilliams.net	

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

UM 1121

)
In the Matter of) APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL
) RECONSIDERATION AND
OREGON ELECTRIC UTILITY) CLARIFICATION OF COMMISSION
COMPANY, LLC, et al.,) ORDER NO. 04-352 AND ALJ LOGAN'S
) RULING CLARIFYING ORDER
Application for Authorization to Acquire	
Portland General Electric Company	
)

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to ORS § 756.561 and OAR § 860-014-0095, the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities ("ICNU"), the Citizens' Utility Board ("CUB"), and the Associated Oregon Industries ("AOI") (collectively, "Joint Intervenors") request partial reconsideration and clarification of Oregon Public Utility Commission ("OPUC" or the "Commission") Order No. 04-352 and Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Logan's July 1 Ruling clarifying Order No. 04-352 ("Ruling) (collectively, the "Intervenor Funding Orders" or the "Orders"). In Order No. 04-352, the Commission approved the proposed budgets of each of the Joint Intervenors and required the Joint Intervenors to "submit detailed billings of monies expended on the first of July, September, and November 2004." Re Oregon Elec. Util. Co., OPUC Docket No. UM 1121, Order No. 04-352 at 3 (June 23, 2004). Judge Logan subsequently issued the Ruling clarifying the format for the detailed billings. Ruling at 1-2.

Joint Intervenors request reconsideration of two aspects of the Orders: 1) the requirement in Order No. 04-352 to submit detailed billings prior to the submittal of any

PAGE 1 – APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF INTERVENOR FUNDING ORDERS

Requests for Payment; and 2) ALJ Logan's Ruling clarifying that the billing format should include a detailed description of the monies spent. Joint Intervenors are not seeking reconsideration of the approval of the proposed budgets or Issue Fund Grants. Joint Intervenors request reconsideration of the Intervenor Funding Orders for the following reasons:

- 1. Reconsideration of the Intervenor Funding Orders is required to correct an error of law or fact. Allowing the Commission, ALJ, and other parties to view the detailed billings of Joint Intervenors at this point is not consistent with the Intervenor Funding Agreement ("IFA");
- 2. Good cause exists for further examination of the decision. Joint Intervenors will be unduly prejudiced if they are required to submit detailed billing information prior to a Request for Payment because such disclosure will reveal Joint Intervenors' litigation strategy during the course of the proceeding; and
- 3. The Intervenor Funding Orders require disclosure of detailed billing information that could reveal specific research areas, litigation strategies, and confidential communications that are protected under the attorney/client privilege or work product doctrine.

Joint Intervenors request that the Intervenor Funding Orders be reconsidered and amended to remove the requirement that Joint Intervenors submit detailed billings of monies expended on the first of July, September, and November 2004. In addition, Joint Intervenors request that the Commission clarify that the level of information provided to the Commission and to the UM 1121 service list in the July 9, 2004 Intervenor Fund Grants Report is sufficient to comply with the Intervenor Funding Orders until such time as any Joint Intervenor makes a Request for Payment. Joint Intervenors have no objection to a requirement to submit similar summaries on the first of September and November 2004 to aid the Commission in implementing the IFA.

BACKGROUND

On June 23, 2004, in Order No. 04-352, the Commission granted the Issue Fund Grant requests of ICNU, CUB, and AOI, and required Joint Intervenors to submit "detailed billings," showing the amounts expended on the case on the first of July, September, and November 2004. ICNU was granted an Issue Fund Grant in the amount of \$95,000, CUB was granted \$81,654, and AOI received a grant in the amount of \$55,000. On June 29, 2004, AOI filed a summary of its expenditures. On July 1, 2004, ALJ Logan issued the Ruling finding that AOI's filing was insufficient and clarifying the format of the detailed billing information requested in Order No. 04-352. The Ruling required the Joint Intervenors to submit detailed billing reports with itemized time entries by July 9, 2004. On July 9, 2004, the Joint Intervenors filed a Motion for Partial Stay of the Intervenor Funding Orders. Joint Intervenors also submitted Intervenor Fund Grant Reports summarizing the "eligible expenses" spent to date in UM 1121, in partial compliance with the Intervenor Funding Orders. Joint Intervenors stated in their Motion for Partial Stay that they intended to file an Application for Reconsideration by July 23, 2004.

ARGUMENT

Any party may file for reconsideration of a Commission order within 60 days of the date of service of that order. OAR § 860-014-0095(1); ORS § 756.561. The Commission may grant an application for reconsideration "if sufficient reason therefor is made to appear." ORS § 756.561(1). Under the Commission rules, the OPUC may grant reconsideration if the applicant shows that there is: 1) new evidence which was unavailable and not reasonably discoverable before issuance of the order; 2) a change in the law or agency policy since the date

PAGE 3 –APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF INTERVENOR FUNDING ORDERS

the order was issued; 3) an error of law or fact in the order; or 4) good cause for further examination. OAR § 860-014-0095(3). Any of the above grounds, if essential to the Commission's decision, constitutes a sufficient reason to grant reconsideration. Joint Intervenors request reconsideration of the Intervenor Funding Orders because the Orders contain an error of law or fact, and there is good cause for further examination.

A. The Intervenor Funding Orders are Inconsistent with the Intervenor Funding Agreement

The Intervenor Funding Orders are inconsistent with the IFA because they require Joint Intervenors to unnecessarily disclose highly sensitive detailed billing information prior to a Request for Payment or related Commission audit. The IFA prescribes the procedures for requesting and obtaining an Issue Fund Grant. These procedures provide protections to ensure that the Issue Fund is not overspent and intervenors are reimbursed only for "eligible expenses," as defined by the IFA. Re Temporary Rules, OPUC Docket No. AR 462, Order No. 03-388 Attachment B, IFA at § 4.2.3 (Feb. 5, 2003). At the time an intervenor requests payment, the Commission may audit the unprivileged records of intervenors, as necessary, to verify the accuracy of the information provided in the intervenor's Request for Payment. Id. at § 7.10. Thus, submission of detailed billing information prior to a Request for Payment is unnecessary and inconsistent with the language and spirit of the IFA.

The 2003 legislature adopted Senate Bill 205, which authorized the Commission to approve IFAs. In Order No. 03-388, the OPUC adopted temporary rules governing intervenor funding ^{1/2} and approved the IFA. Re Temporary Rules, OPUC Docket No. AR 462, Order No.

PAGE 4 –APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF INTERVENOR FUNDING ORDERS

-

These rules became permanent in January 2004. <u>Re Adoption of Rules</u>, OPUC Docket No. AR 465, Order No. 04-007 (Jan. 6, 2004).

03-388 (July 2, 2003). According to the intervenor funding rules adopted by the Commission, "the terms of an [intervenor funding] agreement will be binding on all organizations seeking a grant under that agreement and will be followed by the Commission in administering the agreement." OAR § 860-012-0100(2). Thus, the Commission and Joint Intervenors have an obligation to follow the terms and procedures set forth in the IFA. *See* Belozer Poultry Farms.

Inc. v. Portland Gen. Elec. Co., OPUC Docket No. UC 201, Order No. 92-825 at 10 (June 8, 1992) (finding that the Commission must follow its own rules). Likewise, the IFA provides that the granting of "an Issue Fund Grant shall constitute a binding obligation on the Commission to order reimbursement of Eligible Expenses" IFA at § 6.5.

The Intervenor Funding Orders are inconsistent with the procedures prescribed by the IFA. These procedures provide sufficient protections to ensure that Joint Intervenors will not be reimbursed for expenses that are not deemed "eligible"; thus, monitoring the expenses incurred by Joint Intervenors is unnecessary at this time. In order to receive payment from the Portland General Electric ("PGE") Issue Fund Grant, Joint Intervenors must submit a Request for Payment. Id. at § 7.3. When a Request for Payment is made, Joint Intervenors are obligated to "[i]temize the expenses, payees, and hourly rates of amounts to be reimbursed" and "[d]emonstrate that the expenses are reasonable and are directly attributable to issues and positions pursued on behalf of a particular customer class and consistent with the intervenor's proposed budget" Id. at § 7.3. Joint Intervenors may not request funds in excess of those incurred for "eligible expenses" and the Commission has the ability, through an audit of Joint Intervenors' unprivileged records, to ensure that Joint Intervenors comply with this obligation

following a Request for Payment.^{2/} <u>Id.</u> at § 7.10. The IFA does not require itemized expense reports or records to be submitted at this time because no party has submitted a Request for Payment and the Commission has not ordered an audit with regard to such a Request. The Commission will have ample opportunity to examine the itemized expenses and, if desired, the unprivileged billing records of Joint Intervenors once a Request for Payment is made to determine if those expenses are "eligible" in accordance with the IFA. Thus, there is no need to require Joint Intervenors to disclose this sensitive information at this time.

Requiring detailed billings to monitor the Issue Fund and ensure that it will not be overspent is unnecessary because: 1) the Commission has already approved Joint Intervenors' Issue Fund Grants; 2) the Commission has a binding obligation to reimburse Joint Intervenors for eligible expenses in these amounts after a Request for Payment is made; and 3) Joint Intervenors may not request reimbursement for more than approved in Order 04-352, without seeking Commission approval for a proposed budget amendment.

Pursuant to the IFA, the Commission may not approve Issue Fund Grants in excess of the Issue Fund. IFA at § 4.2.3. In Order No. 04-352, the Commission granted the three Issue Fund Grants, noting that the issuance of the Grants in this docket left \$9,000 in the PGE Issue Fund, with the possibility of additional money being added to the Fund from other dockets. Order No. 04-352 at 2. Thus, the Commission has already determined that the Issue Fund is sufficient to satisfy all three Issue Fund Grants. In addition, the Commission has an obligation to reimburse Joint Intervenors for eligible expenses incurred in this docket, in

_

Pursuant to § 7.10 of the Intervenor Funding Agreement, "[t]he Commission may audit the relevant, not privileged, records of any intervenor submitting a Request for Payment . . . as necessary to verify the accuracy of the information provided in the Request for Payment"

accordance with their proposed budgets. IFA at § 6.5. Thus, this money is already fully committed for the purpose of determining whether funds will be available from the PGE Issue Fund to assist intervenors in other eligible proceedings. Finally, Joint Intervenors may not request reimbursement for a greater amount of money than the Commission approved in Order No. 04-352, and the Commission may not grant reimbursement in excess of the approved Issue Fund Grants, unless Joint Intervenors request an amendment to their proposed budgets. Id. at §§ 6.7, 7.6. The Commission may only grant such an amendment if it is not in excess of the Issue Fund. Id. at § 7.6. Therefore, there is no danger that the PGE Issue Fund will be overspent due to the Issue Fund Grants approved in this proceeding, and thus no reason to monitor the expenses incurred by Joint Intervenors to ensure the Issue Fund is not overspent.

B. Good Cause Exists to Reconsider the Intervenor Funding Orders

Good cause exists for prohibiting disclosure of the detailed billings during this proceeding, because the premature release of such information could create an unfair advantage for opposing parties. In this case, the billing records disclose sensitive information that detail Joint Intervenors' strategies in this proceeding, including: 1) the expert witnesses retained by Joint Intervenors; 2) the work being performed by expert witnesses; 3) the legal research being conducted by counsel for Joint Intervenors; 4) the allocation of resources; 5) the contacts with third parties; and 6) the general strategy of Joint Intervenors. Disclosure of this type of information during the proceeding would harm Joint Intervenors' ability to effectively participate in this Docket. It is improper to prejudice a party in this manner simply because a party received an Intervenor Funding Grant.

This proceeding involves the potential transfer of ownership of the largest utility in Oregon, which only may be approved if the Commission finds that it serves PGE's "customers in the public interest." ORS § 757.511(3). Joint Intervenors, as representatives of PGE's customer classes, have an overwhelming interest in making sure this transaction serves their constituents in the public interest. To do so, Joint Intervenors must be able to prepare their arguments without divulging their strategy and case preparation to other parties. The information that would be disclosed under the Intervenor Funding Orders includes detailed descriptions of research performed and time spent on different aspects of the case by both outside counsel and expert witnesses. This information, if divulged to other parties or even the ALJ hearing the case, could impair Joint Intervenors' ability to adequately prepare their case to determine whether the transaction is in the public interest.

Joint Intervenors are the only parties, out of over 40 parties, that have been required to disclose detailed billings. No other party has been ordered to disclose any billings, and Joint Intervenors will not be privy to the legal strategies of any other parties. Allowing all parties to have access to only some parties' billings unduly prejudices those parties who are required to make such disclosures. Thus, the Commission should abandon the requirement that detailed billings be disclosed at this point in the proceeding.

C. Descriptions of Legal Services Provided on the Billing Statements Are Protected by the Attorney/Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine

Pursuant to Oregon Evidence Code ("OEC") 503(2), "[a] client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client"

The Ninth Circuit has recognized that "correspondence, bills, ledgers, statements, and time

PAGE 8 –APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF INTERVENOR FUNDING ORDERS

records which also reveal the motive of the client in seeking representation, litigation strategy, or the specific nature of the services provided, such as researching particular areas of law, fall within the [attorney/client] privilege." <u>Clarke v. Am. Commerce Nat'l Bank</u>, 974 F.2d 127, 129 (9th Cir. 1992). Similarly, the work product doctrine protects from disclosure those documents prepared in anticipation of litigation, unless the requesting party can show an express need for the information and no other means of obtaining it. ORCP 36 B(3).

The detailed billings directed to be disclosed include some information protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or work product doctrine. The billing statements provided by legal counsel and retained experts include: 1) the date the service was performed; 2) the attorney or expert who performed the service; 3) a detailed description of the services performed; 4) the amount of time spent performing the service; and 5) the dollar amount billed. Some aspects of the billing statements are protected by attorney/client privilege because they reveal the "specific nature of the services provided," including the areas of law researched and Joint Intervenors' litigation strategy. These statements are also protected by the work product doctrine because they were prepared in anticipation of litigation by the attorneys and experts of Joint Intervenors. In addition, pursuant to the IFA, the Commission may not review privileged material, even if it is relevant to the Issue Fund Grant, when performing an audit of a party's Request for Payment and expenses incurred. IFA at § 7.10. Similarly, the Commission should not require an intervenor to disclose privileged material at any time.

Joint Intervenors recognize that ALJ Logan's Ruling sought to allow the production of billing information in a manner that would not reveal attorney/client or work product material. However, it would be extremely difficult to produce the information in a

manner consistent with the Ruling. Creating the data necessary to comply with the level of detail requested by the Ruling would be very time consuming and unduly burdensome because Joint Intervenors would be required to either redact their detailed bills, or create entirely new bills, to protect from disclosing the attorney/client or work product material. This burden would significantly detract from Joint Intervenors' time and the financial resources necessary to fully participate in the ongoing proceeding for which the Intervenor Funding Grant was awarded, and be counter-productive to the purpose of the intervenor funding program. Furthermore, some information, such as the allocation of resources in the case, would be virtually impossible to protect through redaction. Finally, unlike attorneys, expert witnesses on electric utility matters traditionally have not submitted billings with detailed time entries like those sought in the Ruling.

CONCLUSION

Joint Intervenors, in partial compliance with Order No. 04-352, submitted Intervenor Funding Grant Reports, summarizing the expenses incurred in this proceeding. Joint Intervenors do not object to submitting summaries with this same level of detail on the first of September and November 2004 to aid the Commission in implementing the IFA. However, Joint Intervenors object to disclosing detailed billing information that could jeopardize their ability to effectively participate in this proceeding.

The Commission should grant reconsideration and clarification of the provisions in the Intervenor Funding Orders directing Joint Intervenors to submit detailed billings. The Orders contain errors of law and fact that are inconsistent with the procedures agreed upon and approved in the IFA. Furthermore, good cause exists to reconsider the Order because disclosure

of the information in the detailed billings could result in undue prejudice to the Joint Intervenors, creating an unfair advantage to other parties who become aware of Joint Intervenors' litigation strategy. The Commission will have the full opportunity to request and review detailed information regarding the eligible expenses of Joint Intervenors after a Request for Payment has been made. Because no party has requested payment, disclosure of this information at this time is improper. Thus, the Commission should reconsider the Orders, and clarify that detailed billings are not required at this time.

WHEREFORE, ICNU, CUB and AOI request that the Commission grant Joint

Intervenors' Application for Partial Reconsideration and Clarification.

Dated this 23rd day of July, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD

Lusan Ecodorfer by 145

Citizens' Utility Board

620 SW Broadway, Suite 308

Portland, OR 97205

(503) 227-1984 phone

(503) 274-2956 fax

jason@oregoncub.org

DAVISON VAN CLEVE, P.C.

S. Bradley Van Cleve

Irion A. Sanger

Davison Van Cleve, P.C.

1000 SW Broadway, Suite 2460

Portland, OR 97205

(503) 241-7242 phone

(503) 241-8160 fax

mail@dvclaw.com

Of Attorneys for the Industrial Customers of

Northwest Utilities

ASSOCIATED OREGON INDUSTRIES

Mary Ann Hutton

Mary Ann Hutton

Canon and Hutton, Attorneys at Law

9999 NE Worden Hill Road

Dundee, OR 97115

(503) 538-0600 phone

(503) 538-0603 fax

mah@canonandhutton.com

Of Attorneys for Associated Oregon

Industries

PAGE 12 -APPLICATION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF INTERVENOR FUNDING ORDERS