## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

## DR 10, UE 88, and UM 989

In the Matters of	)
The Application of Deutland Concerl Electric	)
The Application of Portland General Electric Company for an Investigation into Least	)
Cost Plan Plant Retirement, (DR 10)	) RULING
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	)
11 E	)
for Order Approving Tariff Sheets	·
Implementing Rate Reduction. (UM 989)	

## DISPOSITION: MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULE GRANTED

In my December 21, 2007 Conference Report, I directed the parties to identify all exhibits and outstanding motions from Phase I of these remand proceedings. While I established no specific date for such filings, the report implied that the parties should include such information with other filings relating to the scope of, and process for, the remaining proceedings.

On January 16, 2008, the Utility Reform Project, Lloyd K. Marbet, and Colleen O'Neil (collectively URP)<sup>1</sup> filed a motion to amend the schedule for identifying Phase I exhibits and outstanding motions. URP proposes that the Phase I parties first informally exchange lists of motions and exhibits and then make a joint filing of that information on January 29, 2008.

URP's motion is granted, with one condition. In my earlier report, I asked the parties to not only identify outstanding motions, but, if so, also whether they intend to pursue them. Accordingly, the parties may make a joint filing containing the requested information, provided that the moving party of any identified motion also clarify whether it still seeks a ruling on the request.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 18th day of January, 2008.

Michael Grant Chief Administrative Law Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I also request URP's counsel, Daniel Meek, to confirm for the record the parties he is representing in these proceedings. Records from the Commission and the Court of Appeals indicate that Mr. Meek is actually representing two sets of parties: (1) URP, Marbet, and O'Neil in docket UE 88; and (2) URP, Marbet and Linda Williams in docket UM 989.