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IPCO REQUEST TO POSTPONE ITS SCHEDULED 1999 INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN (IRP) FILING

On August 5, 1998, Idaho Power Company (Idaho Power; Company) filed a letter request with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Commission) requesting Commission authorization to postpone its scheduled June 1999 electric Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) filing until June 2000, and then every two years thereafter.  By prior Commission Order No. 22299, the Company is required to file every two years.

The Company notes that the Commission on July 23, 1998, in Order No. 27636 authorized The Washington Water Power Company (Water Power) to postpone its scheduled 1999 electric IRP filing.  In its Order, the Commission acknowledged Water Power’s representations regarding recent changes and activity in the electric industry and anticipated future changes in the industry at the national and state levels, e.g., customer choice, retail competition, open market, deregulation, and re-regulation.

Idaho Power contends that like Water Power, it too is experiencing uncertainty over future changes in the electric utility industry and believes that a similar one-year delay in its IRP filing requirement would provide it and Commission Staff additional time to assess the scope of future IRP filings and the role that the IRP will play in future electric resource planing processes.

Idaho Power notes that it intends to make a similar request asking the Oregon Public Utilities Commission to allow the Company to defer the filing of its 1999 Oregon Least Cost Plan for one year until June of 2000.

Commission Decision

Staff recommends that the Commission grant the Company’s request for a one-year postponement in its scheduled electric IRP filing.  Staff recommends that the Commission treat the Company’s filing as a Rule 53(a) Petition requesting modification, amendment or stay of an existing Order.  Staff recommends that the Commission grant the requested relief upon a finding of good cause without further notice or Modified Procedure.  Does the Commission concur with Staff’s recommendation?  If not, what is the Commission’s preference?
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