

**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**

On December 10, 2008, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission) held a prehearing conference in the above-captioned docket. The following parties appeared at the conference: Stephanie Andrus on behalf of the Commission Staff (Staff); Douglas Tingey and Paul Conable on behalf of Portland General Electric Company (PGE); Catriona McCracken on behalf of the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon (CUB); and Bradley Van Cleve on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU). Bill Lehman participated by telephone on behalf of Turlock Irrigation District.

The primary purpose of the conference was to set a procedural schedule after the Commission's recent decision to re-open the record in this docket and issue a bench request to PGE. CUB and ICNU objected to the Commission's decision to re-open the record, primarily on the grounds that PGE failed to meet its burden of proof and should not be given a second opportunity to present its case. CUB and ICNU requested to brief the issue of whether the record should be re-opened. After considering arguments from CUB, ICNU, and PGE, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) denied this request, but noted that CUB and ICNU may file a motion to reconsider the Commission's decision.

The ALJ requested that PGE file its responses to the Commission's bench request as testimony. The following schedule was adopted:

PGE Files Opening Testimony	January 30, 2009
Staff, CUB, and ICNU File Response Testimony	February 27, 2009
PGE Files Reply Testimony	March 20, 2009
Hearing <sup>1</sup>	April 20, 2009 9:30 a.m., Main Hearing Room

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

Although the parties are not limited to the issues raised in the bench request, the Commission would prefer that the parties limit their additional testimony and arguments to the questions regarding the installation and maintenance of the upgraded LP1 turbine if possible. Parties should avoid making arguments in testimony that are more appropriate for post-hearing briefs.

Dated this 11th day of December, 2008, at Salem, Oregon.

---

Sarah K. Wallace  
Administrative Law Judge