

**From:** [TOEWS Kimberly \\* PUC](#)  
**To:** [TOEWS Kimberly \\* PUC](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Procedural inquiry regarding UE 416 - oral argument  
**Date:** Thursday, July 27, 2023 10:42:22 AM

---

**From:** MOSER Nolan \* PUC  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 27, 2023 10:36 AM  
**To:** [carolinecilek@lclark.edu](mailto:carolinecilek@lclark.edu)  
**Cc:** [Lauren@nwenergy.org](mailto:Lauren@nwenergy.org); [diego@nwenergy.org](mailto:diego@nwenergy.org); [rcavanagh@nrdc.org](mailto:rcavanagh@nrdc.org); [angusduncan99@gmail.com](mailto:angusduncan99@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Procedural inquiry regarding UE 416 - oral argument

Hi Caroline, ALJ Lackey forwarded me your inquiry.

On your first question, there is no specific deadline (ALJ Lackey may set one later via memo) but, you should assume a request should be made at or near the start of briefing.

On your second question, oral arguments will be limited in this case to attorneys actively representing their respective parties. However, as we have done in the past, witnesses for each party can be available for questions. For example, if a Commissioner asks a question regarding a policy issue that may be best answered by your witness, that witness may be invited to provide the answer.

On a separate but related matter, I am aware that "Opening Statements" have been built into the procedural schedule for the evidentiary hearing. I clarify, and ALJ Lackey will again clarify in a future memo, that these opening statements may be provided by any representative of a party, including a non-attorney, with the understanding that non-attorneys may not make legal argument.

I plan to docket this communication because other parties may be interested in these procedural issues.

Thank you,

Nolan Moser | Chief Administrative Law Judge  
Oregon Public Utility Commission | 201 High St. SE, Suite 100 | Salem, OR 97301  
503-689-3622 | [nolan.moser@puc.oregon.gov](mailto:nolan.moser@puc.oregon.gov)

**From:** Caroline Cilek <[carolinecilek@lclark.edu](mailto:carolinecilek@lclark.edu)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 26, 2023 11:54 AM  
**To:** LACKEY Alison \* PUC <[Alison.LACKEY@puc.oregon.gov](mailto:Alison.LACKEY@puc.oregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** Lauren McCloy <[Lauren@nwenergy.org](mailto:Lauren@nwenergy.org)>; Diego Rivas <[diego@nwenergy.org](mailto:diego@nwenergy.org)>; Cavanagh, Ralph <[rcavanagh@nrdc.org](mailto:rcavanagh@nrdc.org)>; Angus Duncan <[angusduncan99@gmail.com](mailto:angusduncan99@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Procedural inquiry regarding UE 416 - oral argument

Dear ALJ Lackey:

I hope this email finds you well.

My name is Caroline Cilek, and I am acting as local counsel for NWECC and NRDC, intervenors in UE 416, PGE's general rate case. I have several procedural questions concerning oral argument in UE 416.

First, the UE 416 [schedule](#) states that oral argument will occur on Tuesday, October 31, 2023, if requested. By what date must an intervenor request oral argument?

Second, who can present oral argument in this matter? Does it depend on whether the oral argument is legal- or policy-based? For example, can NWECC's Policy Director, a non-attorney, present policy-based oral argument?

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Caroline