

ISSUED: July 19, 2005

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UF 4218 / UM 1206

In the Matter of )  
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC )  
COMPANY )  
Application for an Order Authorizing the )  
Issuance of 62,500,000 Shares of New )  
Common Stock Pursuant to ORS 757.410 )  
et seq. (UF 4218) )

and )

RULING

In the Matter of )  
STEPHEN FORBES COOPER, LLC, as )  
Disbursing Agent, on behalf of the )  
RESERVE FOR DISPUTED CLAIMS )  
Application for an Order Allowing the )  
Reserve for Disputed Claims to Acquire )  
the Power to Exercise Substantial Influence )  
over the Affairs and Policies of Portland )  
General Electric Company Pursuant to )  
ORS 757.511 (UM 1206) )

**DISPOSITION: PETITIONS TO INTERVENE GRANTED;  
SCHEDULE SET.**

On July 19, 2005, a prehearing conference was held in Salem, Oregon. The following made appearances: City of Portland; Community Action Directors of Oregon/ Oregon Energy Coordinators Association (CADO/OECA); Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU); Stephen Forbes Cooper, LLC; Pacific Power & Light dba PacifiCorp; Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA); Bonneville Power Administration (BPA); Portland General Electric Company (PGE); Commission Staff (Staff); Utility Reform Project (URP); Citizens' Utility Board (CUB); and PGE Mutual Utility.

Petitions to Intervene had been filed by URP, ICNU, City of Portland, PacifiCorp, PGE Mutual Utility, Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB), BPA, and CADO/OECA. There were no objections to those petitions. Those petitions were granted. Citizens' Utility Board provided notice of intent to intervene, and BOMA stated

that it intended to petition to intervene at a later date. In addition, ICNU filed a notice of intent to request an issue fund grant pursuant to the Intervenor Funding Agreement.

The parties agreed to the following schedule, which I adopted at the conference:

Deadline for petitions to intervene and IFA budgets	July 29, 2005
Applicant testimony	August 10, 2005
Staff and Intervenor testimony	September 9, 2005
All parties simultaneous reply testimony	September 28, 2005
<i>Ruling on issues to be addressed in hearing and briefs</i>	<i>October 3, 2005</i>
All parties cross-examination statements	October 7, 2005
All parties executive summary of issues	October 11, 2005
<i>Ruling on schedule of hearing</i>	<i>October 12, 2005</i>
Hearing (notice to be issued at a later date)	October 17 & 21, 2005
All parties simultaneous briefs	October 27, 2005
Oral argument (if needed)	October 31, 2005 week

The parties also agreed to workshops and settlement conferences scheduled for August 4, August 17, and September 20. The administrative hearings division is not involved in setting those events, and the responsibility is with the parties to plan those conferences. In addition, beginning September 9, 2005, the parties agreed to accelerated responses to discovery of seven (7) business days. The simultaneous reply testimony is for reply to testimony filed on September 9 only, and is not the place to raise new issues. For any witnesses not testifying at hearing, the required affidavits swearing to the testimony may be filed in advance of hearing with the filing center or may be submitted at the hearing.

The October 3 ruling will set out the issues to be addressed in order in the executive summary and brief. The executive summary should address each issue separately and should be a concise narrative statement of the authoring party's position on each issue set forth in the October 3 ruling. It is not necessary to cite to the prefiled testimony. Two good examples of an executive summary are written by Citizens' Utility Board and Fred Meyer in UE 170, found on the Commission website in e-dockets.

The dates for filing are considered "in-hand" dates. Finally, I refer the parties to the Administrative Hearings Procedures for contested case proceedings, located at [www.puc.state.or.us](http://www.puc.state.or.us) under the heading "Commission Overview."

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 19th day of July, 2005.

---

Christina M. Smith  
Administrative Law Judge