

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)
OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY FOR) CASE NO. IPC-E-13-10
AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT POWER)
COST ADJUSTMENT (PCA) RATES FOR)
ELECTRIC SERVICE FROM JUNE 1, 2013) ORDER NO. 32847
THROUGH MAY 31, 2014)**

On May 31, 2013, the Commission issued Order No. 32821 establishing this year’s Power Cost Adjustment (“PCA”). On June 15, 2013, Pacific Steel & Recycling (“Pacific Steel”) submitted a letter asking “for reconsideration of the [PCA] being applied to [its] Mayfield car shredding operation. . . .”¹ After carefully reviewing the record, we deny Pacific Steel’s request.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Reconsideration allows a party to bring to the Commission’s attention any question previously determined and thereby affords the Commission an opportunity to rectify any mistake or omission. *Washington Water Power Co. v. Kootenai Environmental Alliance*, 99 Idaho 875, 879, 591 P.2d 122, 126 (1979). The party seeking reconsideration must specify why it “contends that the order or any issue decided in the order is unreasonable, unlawful, erroneous or not in conformity with the law.” RP 331.01. The Commission may grant reconsideration by reviewing the existing record, by written briefs, or by evidentiary hearing. RP 332.

PACIFIC STEEL’S ARGUMENT

Pacific Steel argues, in summary, that the full, 21.7% large power service rate increase should not apply to Mayfield because Mayfield operates outside peak hours and its “peaking utilization is very small.” Pacific Steel thus believes that an increase for Mayfield should more reasonably approximate the 15.3% average ratepayer increase, if not less.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Pacific Steel did not request additional briefing or hearings on this matter. Based on our review of the existing record, we find that Pacific Steel has failed to show that the Order or anything decided in it is unreasonable, unlawful, erroneous, or not in conformity with law. A

¹ No one opposed Pacific Steel’s request. However, Pacific Steel has not filed a proof of service showing that it notified Idaho Power and the other parties about the request and gave them a fair opportunity to respond to it. Proof of service is required by Commission Rule of Procedure (RP) 64.


customer's on-peak or off-peak usage is not relevant to the determination of the PCA. Further, this year's PCA increase was largely driven by lower-than-expected hydro generation and market energy prices that have nothing to do with the delivery of off-peak or on-peak energy. See Order No. 32821 at 2-3. Thus, while we appreciate Pacific Steel bringing its concerns to our attention, we find that its request for reconsideration ultimately lacks merit.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Company's request for reconsideration is denied.

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION. 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 pursuant to the Public Utilities Law and the Idaho Appellate Rules. See *Idaho Code* § 61-627.

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this 11th day of July 2013.



PAUL KJELLANDER, PRESIDENT




MACK A. REDFORD, COMMISSIONER



MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:



Jean D. Jewell
Commission Secretary

O:IPC-E-13-10_kk3_Reconsideration