BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

UF 4218/ UM 1206

In the Matter of)
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPA	ANY)
Application for an Order Authorizing the Issua	ance)
of 62,500,000 Shares of New Common Stock)
Pursuant to ORS 757.410 et seq. (UF 42	218))
and) RULING
una) ROEMIO
In the Matter of)
CTEDIEN CORRECCOORER LLC)
STEPHEN FORBES COOPER, LLC, as)
Disbursing Agent, on behalf of the RESERVE	FOR)
DISPUTED CLAIMS)
Application for an Order Allowing the Reserve	e for)
Disputed Claims to Acquire the Power to Exer	rcise)
Substantial Influence over the Affairs and Poli	icies)
of Portland General Electric Company Pursuar	nt to)
ORS 757.511. (UM 1	1206))

DISPOSITION: DEADLINE SET FOR RESPONSE TO CITY OF PORTLAND'S BRIEF

Responses were due on February 28, 2006, to the application for reconsideration filed by Utility Reform Project (URP). URP's application was based on a specific reason: PGE ratepayers would be better off if PGE was still owned by Enron due to implementation of a new automatic adjustment clause involving taxes collected from ratepayers, under recently enacted Senate Bill 408. The City of Portland (the City), which has already appealed the Commission's decision in this case, filed a brief, which it called a response to URP's application. However, the brief did not address URP's application; instead, it set forth independent reasons why the City believes that an application for reconsideration should be granted.

OAR 860-014-0095(4) allows parties to file a reply to an application for reconsideration; however Commission rules do not provide for a reply to a response to an application. Because parties opposed to reconsideration may be prejudiced by a lack of

opportunity to respond to the City's additional application, I find good cause to modify the rules and allow other parties to file a reply to the City's brief. *See* OAR 860-011-0000(6). Replies are due Monday, March 13, 2006, and may only address the merits, both procedurally and substantively, of the City's filing.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 28th day of February, 2006.

Christina M. Smith Administrative Law Judge