

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UE 399, UM 1964, UM 2134, UM 2142, UM 2167, UM 2185, UM 2186, UM 2201

In the Matters of

PACIFICORP dba PACIFIC POWER,

Request for a General Rate Revision
(UE 399),

Application for Approval of Deferred
Accounting for a Balancing Account Related
to the Transportation Electrification Program
(UM 1964),

Application to Defer Costs Relating to Cedar
Springs II (UM 2134),

Application for Approval of Deferred
Accounting for Cholla Unit 4-Related
Property Tax Expense (UM 2142),

Application for Approval of Deferred
Accounting for Revenues Associated with
Renewable Energy Credits from Pryor
Mountain, (UM 2167),

Application for Approval of Deferred
Accounting and Accounting Order Related to
Non-Contributory Defined Benefit Pension
Plans (UM 2185),

Application for Approval of Deferred
Accounting for Costs Relating to a Renewable
Resource Pursuant to ORS 469A.120
(UM 2186), and

Alliance of Western Energy Consumers,
Application for an Accounting Order
Requiring PacifiCorp to Defer Fly Ash
Revenues (UM 2201).

RULING

DISPOSITION: MOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES FOR LEAVE TO FILE OUT OF TIME DENIED.

On June 13, 2022, the Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA) filed a motion seeking leave to file an out-of-time response to PacifiCorp’s bench request response, dated May 27, 2022. That response was due on June 10, 2022; SBUA seeks to file a response on June 14, 2022.

I deny SBUA’s motion. First, the motion does not comply with our procedural rules, which require that parties filing procedural motions “make a good faith effort to confer with other parties to seek agreement about the subject of the motion” and that the motion “describe the effort to confer and the result of the effort.”¹ Nor did the motion comply with our rules regarding requests for expedited treatment despite appearing to seek a ruling within a single business day.²

Second, SBUA did not sufficiently support its request. It states that it needs to confer with an expert not located in the United States, but does not explain why it was not able to alert the Commission of this impediment in the time between May 27 and June 10. The fact that SBUA “is not reviewing any filings related to this matter” does not provide cause; the Commission expects parties to Commission proceedings to monitor the dockets in which they wish to participate.

Finally, SBUA, like other parties, will have additional opportunity to address the information raised in the Second Bench Request in testimony.

Dated this 14th day of June, 2022, at Salem, Oregon.



Katharine Mapes
Administrative Law Judge

¹ OAR 860-001-0420(2).

² OAR 860-001-0420(6).