

## [Project No. 2474-004]

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Notice of Extension of Time**

June 5, 1995.

The time for filing comments on the application for license for the Oswego River Project No. 2474 is hereby extended until further notice, based on the representation of the parties to Commission staff that active settlement discussions will commence in early June.<sup>1</sup> A new deadline for filing responses will be established in a future notice.

**Lois D. Cashell,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-14127 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**Office of Fossil Energy**

## [Docket No. EA-101-A]

**Application To Amend Electricity Export Authorization, Washington Water Power Company****AGENCY:** Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.**ACTION:** Notice of Application.

**SUMMARY:** Washington Water Power Company (WWP) has submitted a request to amend its existing authorization to export electric energy to Canada pursuant to section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act.

**DATES:** Comments, protests or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before July 10, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments, protests or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Electricity (FE-52), Office of Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Xavier Puslowski (Program Office) 202-586-4708 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202-586-6667.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA).

WWP is currently authorized to export electric energy to Canada pursuant to two separate export authorizations. On September 2, 1994, the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) issued an order in Docket EA-98 authorizing

<sup>1</sup> Notice of Application Ready for Environmental Analysis issued April 3, 1995. (60 FR 19906, Apr. 21, 1995)

WWP and 21 other members of the Western Systems Power Pool (WSPP) to export electric energy to British Columbia Hydro & Power Authority (B.C. Hydro), and other future Canadian members of the WSPP, under the terms and conditions of WSPP's pooling agreement and service schedules approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). A condition of the WSPP agreement is that all transactions among WSPP members must be no longer than one year in duration and in accordance with one of four service schedules on file with FERC. The facilities to be utilized for these exports are the international transmission facilities owned and operated by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), also a WSPP member. These facilities consist of two 500-kilovolt (kV) lines located at Blaine, Washington, one 230-kV line at Nelway, British Columbia, and one 230-kV transmission line connecting to West Kootenay Power, Limited, at Nelway, British Columbia. The construction and operation of these international transmission facilities were previously authorized by Presidential Permits PP-10, PP-46, and PP-36, respectively. Exports under this order are authorized through September 2, 1996.

On October 17, 1994, FE issued an order in Docket EA-101 authorizing WWP to export through BPA's Nelway facilities (Presidential Permit PP-36<sup>1</sup>) up to 100 megawatts (MW) of firm capacity and associated energy to West Kootenay Power, Limited, for only the months of November, December, January, and February. This authorization expires in February 1999.

On May 12, 1995, WWP applied to DOE to amend the export authorization issued in Docket EA-101 by: (1) Increasing the authorized export limit to 400 MW; (2) authorizing exports for all months of the calendar year; (3) removing the expiration date of the export authorization; and (4) adding the BPA facilities authorized by Presidential Permits PP-10 and PP-46 to the list of facilities that WWP may use for export.

WWP asserts that amending the export authorization will allow it to more readily respond to the competitive changes taking place in the electric utility industry and that the limits in the existing export authorization create a significant barrier to meeting competitive market opportunities. WWP

<sup>1</sup> In the electricity export authorization issued to Washington Water Power on October 17, 1994, in FE Docket EA-101, Order EA-101, the DOE misidentified the Presidential permit to be used to execute the transfer of electric energy to West Kootenay Power, Limited. The correct Presidential permit number is PP-36, not PP-46.

is seeking an export authorization that will allow it to negotiate contracts for transactions that occur during any month over a period of years. Specifically WWP is requesting authorization to enter into multiple contracts in order to export not more than 400 megawatts of electricity to Canada annually.

**Procedural Matters**

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this application should file a petition to intervene or protest at the address provided above in accordance with SS 385.211 or 385.214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214).

Any such petitions and protests should be filed with DOE on or before the date listed above. Additional copies of such petitions to intervene or protests also should be filed directly with: Charles M. Goligoski, Power Resource Analyst, Washington Water Power, East 1411 Mission, P.O. Box 3727, Spokane, Washington 99220-3727.

Pursuant to 18 CFR 385.211, protests and comments will be considered by the DOE in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a part must file a petition to intervene under 18 CFR 385.214. Section 385.214 requires that a petition to intervene must state, to the extent known, the position taken by the petitioner and the petitioners interest in sufficient factual detail to demonstrate either that the petitioner has a right to participate because it is a State Commission; that it has or represents an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding, including any interest as a consumer, customer, competitor, or a security holder of a party to the proceeding; or that the petitioner's participation is in the public interest.

A final decision will be made on this application after the DOE determines whether the proposed action would impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities as required by Section 202(e) of FPA.

Before an export authorization may be issued, the environmental impacts of the proposed DOE action (i.e., granting the export authorization, with any conditions and limitations, or denying it) must be evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

Copies of this application will be made available, upon request, for public

inspection and copying at the address provided above.

Issued in Washington, DC, June 2, 1995.

**Anthony J. Como,**

Director, Office of Coal & Electricity, Office of Fuels Programs, Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 95-14205 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

## Western Area Power Administration

### Final Principles of Integrated Resource Planning for Use in Resource Acquisition and Transmission Planning

**AGENCY:** Western Area Power Administration, DOE.

**ACTION:** Notice of final principles.

**SUMMARY:** The Western Area Power Administration (Western) will use principles of integrated resource planning (IRP) in its acquisition of resources (supply-side and demand-side) and in its transmission planning. Western published proposed principles for public consideration in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 1994 (59 FR 62724). After considering public comment on that proposal, Western has adopted the final principles of IRP contained in this notice as the policy under which project-specific resource acquisition and transmission planning procedures will be developed. These project-specific procedures will be developed through separate public processes.

**DATES:** The final principles of IRP will be effective on July 10, 1995.

**BACKGROUND:** On August 9, 1994, Western provided notice of its proposed Energy Planning and Management Program (Program), 59 FR 40543, concerning requirements for Western's customers to undertake integrated resource planning consistent with the statutory requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (section 114 of the Energy Policy Act, codified at 42 U.S.C. §§ 7275-7276c). In that notice, Western committed to develop and use principles of IRP in its own resource acquisition and transmission planning. The separate public process to develop principles of IRP began with publication of draft principles of IRP in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 1994. A public information and comment forum was held in Denver, Colorado, on January 12, 1995, to explain the proposed principles and receive comments on the proposal. Written comments on the proposal were received through March 7, 1995.

The final Western principles of IRP outlined in this notice will be used by

Western in its resource acquisition and transmission planning and differ from those proposed in the Program for Western's customers. Western's resource acquisitions are primarily short-term purchases of supplemental resources to firm variable hydropower generation and are not acquisitions of resources to meet long-term load growth. The principles of IRP also have been adapted to Western's transmission planning process, which does not deal with new generation resources, only new or upgraded transmission facilities.

Western currently is involved in other public processes that can have an impact on future purchase power and transmission requirements. The final principles of IRP will be applied when acquiring resources or planning transmission related to the decisions from these other public processes. These principles will serve as the policy under which specific procedures are developed as each project identifies the need to acquire resources or increase Western's transmission capability.

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS:** Western received 4 oral comments at the January 12, 1995, public meeting and 11 comment letters on the proposed principles of IRP published December 6, 1994. The comments received and Western's responses follow.

1. *Comment:* The scope of the principles of IRP should be broadened to possibly include examination of project-use loads.

*Response:* Western is responsible for marketing the power surplus to the needs of the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) projects. Reclamation has jurisdiction for operation of the projects. However, we do agree that there may be opportunities for collaborating with Reclamation to expand the IRP process to include, where feasible, energy efficiency improvements at project-use facilities. Western and Reclamation completed a study in 1992 that indicated very limited opportunity for cost-effective improvements at Central Valley Project project-use facilities. However, Western may continue to evaluate such opportunities as part of project-specific resource acquisition evaluation criteria.

2. *Comment:* Western should increase cooperation with Reclamation on planning studies to extract the maximum possible benefit out of the projects to reduce the need for additional purchases.

*Response:* We agree with this comment. As part of the National Performance Review, Reclamation is reviewing its power functions and operations. Western is cooperating in this effort.

3. *Comment:* The evaluation of supply-side and demand-side alternatives requires some additional clarification of the interplay between the customer demand-side management (DSM) and the Western DSM programs.

*Response:* The evaluation of demand-side alternatives for customers is generally focused on use of DSM to impact the customer's total load to reduce or delay resource acquisitions. Since Western is a partial requirements supplier for most of its customers, the evaluation of Western DSM alternatives will focus upon whether DSM will impact that portion of a customer's load supplied by Western (Western's contract obligation) to reduce the customer's need for the Western resource, which may, in some cases, reduce Western's resource acquisitions. Western DSM alternatives also may include improvements that reduce losses or project use energy efficiency improvements, if such alternatives reduce the amount of energy that Western needs to acquire to meet its contract commitments. A customer DSM activity that reduces only the amount a customer self-generates or purchases from an auxiliary supplier has no impact on Western's obligation and, therefore, is not a Western DSM alternative under these principles.

4. *Comment:* Western's proposal to apply principles of IRP to resource acquisition and transmission planning was strongly supported by one commenter, and Western was commended for developing an internal IRP process by two commenters at the January 12, 1995, public meeting.

*Response:* Western appreciates the support of these commenters.

5. *Comment:* Several commenters expressed concerns that these principles of IRP should not interfere with or duplicate existing partnership efforts between our firm power customers and Area Offices for resource acquisition and transmission planning.

*Response:* Western fully supports the on-going processes between Area Offices and customers relating to cost containment, transmission planning and resource acquisition. However, one of the basic foundations of IRP is full public involvement in resource decisions. To the extent that on-going partnership processes, such as the Glen Canyon Replacement Power process, include involvement by all interested stakeholders, those processes can integrate these final principles of IRP within their decision making process without additional effort.

6. *Comment:* The Salt Lake City Area replacement power process for Glen Canyon resources provides for each