

-BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH-

In the Matter of the Acknowledgment of)
PACIFICORP Integrated Resource Plan (RAMPP-)
6))

DOCKET NO. 02-035-07

ORDER

ISSUED: August 28, 2002

By the Commission:

The February 28, 2002 Report and Order on PacifiCorp's sixth Integrated Resource Plan entitled "Resource and Market Planning Program" ("IRP" or "RAMPP-6") in Docket 98-2035-05 directed PacifiCorp to file an updated RAMPP-6 action plan. PacifiCorp filed the update on June 17, 2002, and thereupon, by Order, Docket No. 98-2035-05 was closed.

On July 19, 2002, the Committee of Consumer Services ("Committee") petitioned the Commission to schedule a technical conference at which PacifiCorp would be directed to explain the key analytical results of the updated action plan and how it conforms with Commission guidelines. The Committee further petitioned the Commission to allow a comment period after the technical conference so parties might respond. The petition was filed in a new docket, No. 02-035-07, because of the closure of Docket No. 98-2035-05 following receipt of the updated action plan.

On July 30, 2002, PacifiCorp filed a response in opposition to the Committee's request. PacifiCorp opposes the request for a technical conference and comment period primarily because it would distract the Company from its intensive effort to produce the entirely new integrated resource plan due in December 2002.

DISCUSSION

The Commission's February 28, 2002 Order did not acknowledge RAMPP-6 for reason of its failure to comport with current standards and guidelines for integrated resource planning. Though we have opened a new proceeding, Docket No. 02-035-03, to examine future integrated resource planning and the guidelines under which it should occur, we ordered PacifiCorp to prepare its December 2002 IRP consistent with current standards and guidelines.

The February 28, 2002 Order also requires the Company to file an updated action plan because parties, including PacifiCorp, argued that the RAMPP-6 action plan's reliance on out-of-date assumptions called its credibility and regulatory usefulness into question. Even when, as in this case, we do not acknowledge an IRP, it is still the best statement available to the parties of PacifiCorp's plans to meet the demands for service in its territory. The updated action plan meets this need.

In the interest of moving the integrated resource planning process expeditiously, and with a minimum of procedural confusion, toward the December 2002 deadline, we will not now embark on a detailed consideration of the merits of the updated action plan. Instead, we will compare and contract it to the December IRP. In this way, any questions parties may have regarding that plan may be considered in connection with the review and analysis of PacifiCorp's December 2002 IRP.

ORDER

1. The Committee's request for a technical conference and comment period is denied.
2. PacifiCorp's updated action plan for RAMPP-6 is on record until replaced by PacifiCorp's December 2002 IRP action plan. DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 28th day of August, 2002.

/s/ Stephen F. Mecham, Chairman

/s/ Constance B. White, Commissioner

/s/ Richard M. Campbell, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Julie Orchard,

Commission Secretary

G#30657