ISSUED: March 24, 2004

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

UE 165/UM 1187

In the Matters of)
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	ý))
Application for a Hydro Generation Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, (UE 165)) PREHEARING CONFERENCE) MEMORANDUM
and))
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC))
Application for Deferral of Costs and Benefits Due to Hydro Generation Variance. (UM 1187)	,)))

On March 23, 2005, a prehearing conference was held. The primary purpose of the prehearing conference was to establish a procedural schedule for both dockets following settlement of the issues in both dockets by two parties.

Appearances were entered as follows: Stephanie Andrus appeared on behalf of the Commission Staff (Staff); Doug Tingey appeared on behalf of Portland General Electric Company (PGE); Bob Jenks appeared on behalf of the Citizens' Utility Board (CUB); and Melinda Davison appeared on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU).

Participants at the prehearing conference, representing all parties in both dockets, agreed to a consolidated schedule to address issues in both proceedings. Parties did not request consolidation of the two dockets, however, and the dockets remain independent. The schedule is revised as follows for UE 165 and UM 1187, with the understanding that all dates for filing are considered "in hand" dates:

PGE and Staff file Stipulation(s)	April 11, 2005
PGE and Staff file testimony supporting	April 18, 2005
Stipulation(s)	
CUB and ICNU file rebuttal testimony to	June 2, 2005
Stipulation(s)	
PGE and Staff file surrebuttal testimony	July 1, 2005
Hearing (Details TBD)	July 12, 2005
Opening briefs due	July 27, 2005
Closing briefs due	August 8, 2005

Parties also agreed to institute a shortened discovery schedule after July 1, 2005. Responses to discovery requests will be due within four days. PGE also agreed to submit a letter to adequately extend the suspension period for UE 165 prior to expiration of the second suspension on April 5, 2005. I will work with PGE to find a satisfactory suspension date.

The hearing will address all testimony previously submitted in either docket. In UE 165, several rounds of testimony had already been submitted and a hearing was scheduled for April 19, 2005. UM 1187 was still in the beginning stages of the procedural schedule, however, and no testimony had been submitted. Consequently, the hearing will address testimony submitted in UE 165 as well as testimony regarding the Stipulation(s).

Further details about the hearing will be provided at a later time. I note that due to potential scheduling conflicts, these dockets may be reassigned to another administrative law judge.

Dated this 24th day of March, 2005, at Salem, Oregon.

Traci A. G. Kirkpatrick Administrative Law Judge