

ISSUED: May 2, 2008

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UE 196

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	)	PREHEARING
COMPANY,	)	CONFERENCE
	)	REPORT
Application to Amortize the Boardman	)	
Deferral.	)	

**DISPOSITION: SCHEDULE ESTABLISHED**

A prehearing conference was held today in the above-captioned docket in Salem, Oregon. The following parties appeared at the conference: Stephanie Andrus on behalf of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon Staff (Staff); Douglas Tingey and Paul Conable on behalf of Portland General Electric Company (PGE); Jason Eisdorfer on behalf of the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon (CUB); and S. Bradley Van Cleve on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU).

The primary purpose of the conference was to discuss whether Staff, CUB, and ICNU wanted an opportunity to submit surrebuttal testimony in response to PGE's reply testimony submitted on April 24, 2008, and to establish a schedule for the remainder of the docket. Staff, CUB, and ICNU were unable to state with certainty whether surrebuttal testimony would be necessary because they are awaiting responses to data requests issued after receipt of PGE's reply testimony. The parties therefore proposed two possible schedules. If Staff, CUB, and ICNU determine that no surrebuttal testimony is necessary, they will file a statement to that effect on June 5, 2008, and a hearing will be held June 30, 2008, at 9:30 a.m. in the Commission's Main Hearing Room. If Staff, CUB, and ICNU determine that surrebuttal is necessary, then the following schedule will be followed:

Staff, CUB, and ICNU File Surrebuttal Testimony	June 5, 2008
PGE files Sur-surrebuttal Testimony	July 10, 2008
Hearing <sup>1</sup>	July 23, 2008, 9:30 a.m., Main Hearing Room

<sup>1</sup> The post-hearing briefing schedule will be determined at the hearing.

Staff, CUB, and ICNU must limit their surrebuttal testimony to responding to new information included in PGE's reply testimony. PGE must limit its sur-surrebuttal testimony to responding to new information included in the other parties' surrebuttal testimony. Parties should avoid making arguments in testimony that are more appropriate for post-hearing briefs.

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of May, 2008, at Salem, Oregon.

---

Sarah K. Wallace  
Administrative Law Judge