

ISSUED: December 19, 2005

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 1209

| | | |
|--|---|--------|
| In the Matter of |) | |
| |) | |
| MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS |) | |
| COMPANY |) | RULING |
| |) | |
| Application for Authorization to Acquire |) | |
| Pacific Power & Light, dba PacifiCorp. |) | |

**DISPOSITION: MOTION CONDITIONALLY GRANTED; TIME FOR
RESPONSE SHORTENED**

On December 16, 2005, MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company (MEHC) and Pacific Power & Light, dba PacifiCorp (PacifiCorp) filed a joint motion to amend the schedule. Under OAR 860-013-0050(3)(d), a party would have 15 days to respond to the motion. Due to the time sensitive nature of this motion, responses are due at 12:00 noon, on December 22, 2005.

MEHC and PacifiCorp's motion states that a majority of the parties have reached, in principle, a global settlement, and the motion suggests a modified schedule to reflect that change to the proceeding. The companies state that Staff, Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon (CUB), and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU) support the amended schedule. In light of the motion, the following schedule is conditionally set:

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Stipulation and supporting testimony | December 27, 2005 |
| Objections and request for hearing | January 10, 2006 |
| Cross-examination statements and | January 17, 2006 |
| Executive summaries (if hearing requested) | |
| Evidentiary hearing (if requested) | January 20, 2006 |

If a hearing is not held to admit evidence, parties should submit affidavits by January 20, 2006, supporting the testimony to be admitted into the record. If a party wishes to request oral argument, it should do so by January 20, 2006. At that time, a briefing and oral argument schedule, if necessary, will be determined.

MEHC and PacifiCorp also request that discovery be suspended while the parties prepare the Stipulation and supporting documents. The companies further request that, after the Stipulation is filed, discovery be limited to issues pertinent to the Stipulation. Without having seen the Stipulation, it does not seem appropriate to limit objections to issues contained therein, particularly if the Stipulation does not address significant issues related to the transaction. The request to suspend discovery until the Stipulation is filed is conditionally granted, and subsequent discovery shall be limited to issues related to the transaction, as indicated by the issues list and previous rulings.

If no person contests any part of the motion, the rulings set forth above shall be final.

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

Christina M. Smith
Administrative Law Judge