

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

CP 1223

In the Matter of the Application of)	
)	
BROADBAND CABLE)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC)	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
)	MEMORANDUM
for a Certificate of Authority To Provide)	
Telecommunications Service in Oregon and)	
Classification as a Competitive)	
Telecommunications Provider)	

On June 2, 2004, a prehearing conference was held in Salem, Oregon. The purpose of the prehearing conference was to identify the parties to the proceeding, to establish a procedural schedule for the docket and to address any other matters raised by the persons present.

Identification of the Parties

Appearances were entered as follows: Michael Weirich, attorney, appeared on behalf of Commission Staff; Paul Safronchik appeared on behalf of Broadband Cable Telecommunications, LLC (Broadband Cable); Jim Tiger, attorney, appeared on behalf of Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company (Clear Creek); Mitchell Moore also appeared on behalf of Clear Creek; and Tom A. Linstrom appeared on behalf of Beaver Creek Cooperative Telephone Company (Beaver Creek).

Based on the information provided in the petition to intervene filed by Clear Creek on May 6, 2004, I found that Clear Creek meets the requirements for an intervenor under OAR 860-013-0021. Acknowledging that no party had contested the petition to intervene within ten (10) days of its service, I granted Clear Creek's petition to intervene in this proceeding.

Although the procedural schedule discussed below does not include a formal due date for petitions to intervene, such petitions shall be accepted pursuant to OAR 860-013-0021. Staff indicated that Beaver Creek represented, off the record, that it intends to file a petition to intervene as a party. Until such petition to intervene is filed and granted, the service list for this proceeding, as attached, shall include Beaver Creek as an interested person.

Procedural Schedule

Persons present at the prehearing conference agreed to the following procedural schedule:

Staff submits a proposed order containing proposed conditions on any certificate of authority to be issued to Broadband Cable	June 17, 2004
Parties file exceptions and/or comments to Staff's proposed order and proposed conditions	July 1, 2004
Parties file reply comments	July 12, 2004

Staff indicated that the persons present at the prehearing conference agreed to engage in informal discussion of the proposed conditions to be imposed on any certificate of authority granted to Broadband Cable prior to Staff's submission of a proposed order. Staff also indicated that the persons present agreed that any party could, at any time, file a motion requesting alternative procedural steps in this proceeding be adopted, such as an opportunity to file testimony or to present oral argument. Absent such a motion, the Commission would issue an order regarding Broadband Cable's application for a certificate of authority following the submission of reply comments by parties.

Other Procedural Matters

I refer the parties to the Administrative Hearings Procedures for contested case proceedings, located at www.puc.state.or.us under the heading "Commission Overview."

Dated this 3rd day of June, 2004, at Salem, Oregon.

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick
Administrative Law Judge