

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UE 161

In the Matter of)	
)	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC)	RULING
COMPANY)	
)	
Adjustments to Schedule 125 (2005 RVM)	
Filing).)	

DISPOSITION: MOTION TO MODIFY PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE GRANTED

The Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU) filed a letter informing me that ICNU, Commission Staff, the Citizens’ Utility Board (CUB) and Portland General Electric desired to continue a settlement conference held on June 3, 2004 to June 11, 2004.

In order to facilitate continued settlement discussions on June 11th, the letter requested changes in the procedural schedule to extend the due date for submission of Staff and Intervenor testimony, and correspondingly other due dates, by a week to ten days. For purposes of this ruling, ICNU’s letter is treated as a Motion to Modify the Procedural Schedule (Motion), as follows:

EVENT	CURRENT DUE DATE	REQUESTED DUE DATE
Staff and Intervenors file testimony	June 18, 2004	June 28, 2004
One day only settlement conference	June 28, 2004	TBD
PGE files reply testimony	July 30, 2004	August 9, 2004
Parties file statements of intent to conduct cross examination	August 11, 2004	August 18, 2004
One day only hearing	August 18, 2004	August 25, 2004
PGE files MONET update	September 1, 2004	September 8, 2004
Parties file simultaneous opening briefs	September 10, 2004	September 17, 2004
Parties file simultaneous reply briefs	September 22, 2004	September 29, 2004
Oral argument, if requested	TBD	TBD

PGE is currently scheduled to file an initial MONET update on June 11, 2004. ICNU did not request that this due date be modified.

ICNU represents that all parties to the proceeding have been notified, by electronic mail, of the requested procedural schedule change. ICNU also represents that no party has voiced an objection as of the date of the letter's filing.

I find that continuing efforts by ICNU, Staff, CUB and PGE to reach settlement warrants modifying the procedural schedule in this docket. Based on ICNU's representations that all parties have been notified of the proposed revisions to the procedural schedule and that no party has raised an objection, I conditionally grant the Motion. A party may still file an objection to the revised procedural schedule by 5:00 p.m., June 14, 2004. If no party files an objection by such time, Staff's Motion is finally granted, and the revised procedural schedule in this docket shall be the dates requested, as set forth above. The modified dates for filing are considered "in hand" dates.

Dated this 10th day of June, 2004, at Salem, Oregon.

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick
Administrative Law Judge