Office of the Secretary
Service Date
August 13, 2026

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY'S 2025 VARIABLE ENERGY RESOURCE INTEGRATION STUDY AND PROPOSED UPDATE TO SCHEDULE 87	)))))	**CASE NO. IPC-E-25-36** **ORDER NO. 37130**

On December 26, 2025, Idaho Power Company ("Company") applied to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") requesting: (1) approval of the Company's proposed Schedule 87 ("Schedule 87"), Intermittent Generation Integration Charges, updated rates, effective February 1, 2026, for which the Company's 2025 Variable Energy Resource ("VER") Integration Study was the basis of, and (2) acknowledgement that the Company complied with the Commission's directives in Order No. 36661 ("Application"). Application at 1.

On January 21, 2026, the Commission issued a Notice of Application, Notice of Suspension of Proposed Effective Date, and Notice of Intervention Deadline. Order No. 36909. The Commission granted intervention to Idaho Winds LLC ("Idaho Winds"). Order No. 36943. On February 26, 2026, the Commission issued a Notice of Modified Procedure, establishing comment deadlines. Order No. 36947. Commission Staff ("Staff") and Idaho Winds filed comments to which the Company replied. No other comments were received.

On June 25, 2026, the Commission issued a Final Order approving Schedule 87 with modifications and ordering the Company to work with Staff on several issues in the next VER study and to meet with interested parties to discuss Idaho Winds' comments filed in this case. Order No. 37076. On July 16, 2026, Idaho Winds filed a Petition for Reconsideration of Order No. 37076 ("Petition"). On July 23, 2026, the Company filed an answer opposing the Petition ("Answer").

Based on our review of the record, we issue this Final Order denying the Petition.

PETITION

Idaho Winds stated that the integration charges approved by the Commission through Order No. 37076 would affect the integration charges Idaho Winds would have to pay in the future as the owner of a 22 megawatt ("MW") qualifying facility ("QF"). Petition at 1. Idaho Winds argued that the issues it identified with how Schedule 87 charges were calculated from the 2025 VER Integration Study should be addressed at this time. *Id.* at 2. Further, Idaho Winds stated that the Commission did not formally address its argument regarding what integration charges renewal QFs should pay. *Id.*

Idaho Winds represented that the impacts of the inaccuracies in how Schedule 87 integration charges were calculated in the 2025 VER Integration Study would have an immediate impact because it and the Company were in negotiations for a QF renewal contract, and how the charges were calculated would have an impact on the rates paid to Idaho Winds under the QF renewal contract with the Company. *Id.* at 5. Idaho Winds believed that waiting for the next VER study to address the Company's calculations for integration charges would lead to an unjust and unreasonable result for Idaho Winds. *Id.*

Idaho Winds represented that in Order No. 33357 the Commission "established a distinction between new QF projects and renewing QF projects." *Id.* at 3. Thus, Idaho Winds argued that it was:

> unjust and unreasonable to use a QF's original online date for purposes of calculating capacity payments but [to] not use the original online date for Integration Charges.

Id. Idaho Winds stated a renewing QF should not be required to pay the same integration charges that new QFs are required to pay. *Id.* at 3–4. Idaho Winds represented that its argument regarding the appropriate integration charges was not formally addressed by the Commission in Order No. 37076 and thus made the Commission's decision have an unjust and unreasonable effect on Idaho Winds. *Id.* at 4.

ANSWER TO THE PETITION

The Company argued that Order No. 37076 was "supported by substantial, competent evidence in the record" and that the Petition should be dismissed because it failed to show that Order No. 37076 was "unreasonable, unlawful, erroneous, or not in conformity with the law," as required by the Commission's Rule of Procedure 331.01. Answer at 1. The Company asserted that Idaho Winds failed to raise new arguments and requested the same relief it asked for in its comments. *Id.* at 4.

Regarding Idaho Winds' argument that its position on the appropriate integration charges for renewal QFs was not formally addressed by the Commission, the Company asserted that the Commission did address Idaho Winds' position by discussing Idaho Winds' concerns and directing the Company to "'discuss with interested parties…the Company's method of calculating the base integration charges for renewal QFs…prior to the new VER Study.'" *Id.* at 5 (quoting Order No.

37076 at 8). The Company went on to detail its process for determining the integration charges when QF energy sales agreements are renegotiated. *Id.* at 5. The Company also stated that Order No. 37076 appropriately addressed Idaho Winds' concerns for double counting integration charges. *Id.* at 5–6.

Next, regarding Idaho Winds' argument that it would be impacted by "unjust and unreasonable rates" if its issues with the calculation for the integration charges were not addressed now, the Company represented that the existing energy sales agreement ("ESA") between the Company and Idaho Winds was not set to expire until 2031. *Id.* at 6. The Company argued that the decision to "negotiate a replacement ESA" prior to the expiration date of the current agreement was up to Idaho Winds. *Id.* The Company represented that Idaho Winds could defer the negotiations for the replacement ESA until the Company's 2027 or 2029 VER studies, and associated integration charges, are updated. *Id.* at 6–7.

COMMISSION FINDINGS AND DECISION

The Commission has the authority to grant or deny reconsideration pursuant to *Idaho Code* § 61-626(2). Reconsideration allows any interested person to bring to the Commission's attention any question previously determined, and it affords the Commission an opportunity to rectify any mistakes or omissions. *Washington Water Power Co., v. Kootenai Environmental Alliance*, 99 Idaho 875, 879, 591 P.2d 122, 126 (1979). The petitioner has 21 days from the date of the final order in which to ask for reconsideration. *Idaho Code* § 61-626(1). An answer that disagrees with the request for reconsideration must be filed within seven days of the petition. IDAPA 31.01.01.331.05.

Under Commission Rule of Procedure 331.01 ("Rule 331"):

> Petitions for reconsideration must specify (a) why the order or any issue decided in it is *unreasonable, unlawful, erroneous or not in conformity with the law*, and (b) the nature and quantity of evidence or argument the petitioner will offer if reconsideration is granted.

IDAPA 31.01.01.331.01 (emphasis added). Further, "the petition…must state whether the petitioners…requests reconsideration by evidentiary hearing, written briefs, comments, or interrogatories." IDAPA 31.01.01.331.03. After a petition for reconsideration is filed, the Commission must issue a decision within 28 days of the filing of the petition on whether it will grant or deny the request. *Idaho Code* § 61-626(2).

Having reviewed the record, the Petition, and the Answer, the Commission denies the Petition. The Commission finds that the Petition does not meet the requirements of *Idaho Code* § 61-626 and Rule 331. Specifically, the Petition only repeats arguments that were addressed in Order No. 37076 and does not sufficiently explain how Order No. 37076 was unreasonable, unlawful, erroneous, or not in conformity with the law.

In the Petition, Idaho Winds argues it is unjust and unreasonable for a QF's original online date to be used to determine capacity payments but not for determining integration charges, and that the Commission did not formally address this argument/concern in Order No. 37076. Petition at 3–4. The Commission finds that Idaho Winds' argument regarding integration charges, and the information supplied in support of that argument, is a repetition of Idaho Winds' disagreement with the Company's calculation method, and Idaho Winds' preferred alternative method for integration charges, which was already asserted in Idaho Winds' Comments and addressed by the Commission in Order No. 37076. Further, the Commission finds Idaho Winds' argument that the Commission did not formally address its arguments/concerns with integration charge calculations unpersuasive. Notably we directed:

> the Company to discuss with interested parties the VERs included in the base portfolio in the 2025 VER [Integration] Study, the Company's method of calculating the base integration charges for renewal QFs, and the issue of including forecasted QFs in the 2025 VER [Integration] Study base portfolio prior to the next VER study.

Order No. 37076 at 7. Merely reiterating an argument that the Commission already decided upon and asserting that the Commission's failure to adopt a certain position renders the Commission's decision unjust and unreasonable, and as a matter not formally addressed, does not demonstrate that a Commission's order was unlawful, unreasonable, erroneous, or not in accordance with the law.

Idaho Winds also argues that not addressing alleged issues with the integration charges now will negatively impact Idaho Winds in its negotiations with the Company on the renewal of a QF ESA between the parties. Petition at 5. However, the Company represents that the existing ESA between the parties is not set to expire until 2031, giving Idaho Winds the opportunity to defer the negotiations for a new ESA until after the Company's 2027 or 2029 VER studies. Answer at 6–7. Thus, it appears that any imminent and direct negative impact of not addressing alleged issues with the integration charges now stems, at least in part, from Idaho Winds' own approach to renegotiating the ESA, rather than a result of the Commission's decision and instructions in

Order No. 37076. An issue arising from a party's actions does not, on its own, establish that a Commission order was unlawful, unreasonable, erroneous, or not in accordance with the law.

Accordingly, for the above reasons the Commission denies the Petition.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition is denied.

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER. Any party aggrieved by this Order or other final or interlocutory Orders previously issued in this case may appeal to the Supreme Court of Idaho within 42 days pursuant to the Public Utilities Law and the Idaho Appellate Rules.

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this 13th day of August 2026.

EDWARD LODGE, PRESIDENT

JOHN R. HAMMOND JR., COMMISSIONER

DAYN HARDIE, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

Monica Barrios-Sanchez
Commission Secretary

I:\Legal\ELECTRIC\IPC-E-25-36_VER\orders\IPCE2536_Recon_kr.docx