

ISSUED: May 2, 2005

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

DR 10, UE 88, UM 989

In the Matters of)
)
The Application of Portland General Electric)
Company for an Investigation into Least Cost)
Plan Plant Retirement, (DR 10))
)
Revised Tariffs Schedules for Electric)
Service in Oregon Filed by Portland General)
Electric Company, (UE 88))
)
Portland General Electric Company's)
Application for an Accounting Order and for)
Order Approving Tariff Sheets Implementing)
Rate Reduction. (UM 989))

**RULING AND
CONSOLIDATED PREHEARING
CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM**

**DISPOSITION: MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME GRANTED;
PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE REVISED**

On April 28, 2005, a consolidated prehearing conference was held in Salem, Oregon. The purpose of the prehearing conference was to further address the motion by the Utility Reform Project and other parties previously represented in the dockets (URP) and Morgan, Gearhart and Kafoury Brothers, LLC (MGK) to extend the procedural schedule in these proceedings.

Appearances were entered as follows: Stephanie Andrus appeared on behalf of Commission Staff (Staff); Jeanne M. Chamberlain and Jay Dudley appeared on behalf of PGE; Dan Meek appeared by telephone on behalf of URP; and Linda Williams appeared by telephone on behalf of MGK.

URP indicated that it had engaged expert witnesses and was prepared to file testimony on May 19, 2005, provided PGE responded to a prior data request on an extremely expedited basis. PGE agreed to provide a response to URP's prior data requests by May 3, 2005. Parties agreed to the following revised schedule in these proceedings:

PGE files testimony	February 15, 2005
Staff and intervenors file testimony	May 19, 2005
PGE files rebuttal testimony	June 27, 2005

Staff and intervenors file surrebuttal testimony	July 25, 2005
PGE files surrebuttal testimony	August 17, 2005
Hearing (Details TBD)	August 29 – 30, 2005

PGE noted that it agreed to the revised schedule with the qualification that it would not agree to further revisions. I adopted the revised schedule, noting that I considered it to be firm and not subject to any further amendment.

Parties also agreed to, and I approved, two stipulations to the schedule:

1) With the exception of the first round of testimony for each party, successive rounds of testimony will address issues raised in the preceding testimony only; and 2) After submission of PGE's surrebuttal testimony on August 17, 2005, responses to data requests would be expedited on a five business day basis.

URP requested that responses to data requests be expedited on a five business day basis for the entire schedule. PGE objected. As the opportunity for discovery based on PGE's opening testimony has been extensive, with another three weeks available for Staff and intervenors to prepare testimony before its due date, and the intervening time between the due dates for the next two rounds of testimony is significant, I declined to impose an expedited discovery schedule for the entire procedural schedule. Should a party need a response to a data request on an expedited basis, however, I encourage parties to work together to address such needs. Alternatively, a party may file a motion seeking an expedited response.

Dated this 2nd day of May, 2005, at Salem, Oregon.

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick
Administrative Law Judge