BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of the Application of)

HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.

For Approval to Commit Funds in) Excess of \$2,500,000 (excluding) customer contributions) for) Purchase and Installation of Item) Y-49000, Campbell Industrial Park) Generating Station and Transmission) Additions Project.) DOCKET NO. 05-0145

vs

<u>ORDER NO.</u> 22030



<u>Sept. 14</u>, 2005 <u>1</u>o'clock <u>P</u>.M. Filed At

Karen Higsel. Chief Clerk of the Commission

ATTEST: A True Copy KAREN HIGASHI Chief Clerk, Fublic Utilities Commission, State of Hawaii.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

)

In the Matter of the Application of)

HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.

For Approval to Commit Funds in) Excess of \$2,500,000 (excluding) customer contributions) for) Purchase and Installation of Item) Y-49000, Campbell Industrial Park) Generating Station and Transmission) Additions Project.) Docket No. 05-0145 Order No. 22030

<u>ORDER</u>

By this Order, the commission suspends the instant docket, including the 90-day Review Period established by Paragraph 2.3.g.2 of General Order No. 7, until further order of the commission.

I.

Background

2005.1 17. By an application filed on June HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. ("HECO") requests, among other things, commission approval to commit approximately \$134,310,260 for Item Y-49000, Campbell Industrial Park Generating Station and Additions Project ("Proposed Project"), Transmission in accordance with Paragraph 2.3.g.2 of the commission's

¹Application, Exhibits I – XXI, Verification, and Certificate of Service, filed on June 17, 2005 ("Application").

General Order No. 7, Standards for Electric Utility Service in the State of Hawaii ("General Order No. 7"). HECO served copies of the Application on the Division of Consumer Advocacy, Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs ("Consumer Advocate").

II.

Α.

90-day Review Period

Paragraph 2.3.g.2 of General Order No. 7 provides that if the commission does not act on an electric utility's capital expenditure application and render a decision and order within ninety (90) days of filing ("90-day Review Period"), the utility will be allowed "to include the project in its rate base without the determination by the [c]ommission required by this rule." In this docket, the 90-day Review Period for the commission to take action on HECO's Application will expire on September 15, 2005.

в.

Suspension of this Docket

On July 7, 2005, the Consumer Advocate filed its preliminary statement of position: (1) stating that it has questions relating to the Proposed Project; and (2) requesting that the Application be suspended to allow the commission adequate time to: (A) decide certain investigative and

2

application dockets; and (B) review HECO's third Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP-3").²

The Consumer Advocate contends that the following pending matters before the commission may have an impact on the size of and type of generation needed and the timing of when the generation is needed: (1)Docket No. 03 - 0371. the Distributed Generation Proceeding; (2) Docket No. 03-0366, Combined Heat and Power Program Proceeding; the 05-0069, the Efficiency No. Energy Docket; (3)Docket Docket No. 03-0372, the Competitive Bidding Proceeding; (4)03-0253 (5)Docket No. ("HECO's IRP-3 Docket"). and The Consumer Advocate asserts that approval of HECO's IRP-3 Docket is most critical to evaluating HECO's proposed capital expenditures because the IRP Framework' requires that the IRP and program implementation schedule govern all utility expenditures for capital projects, purchase power, and demand-side management programs. The Consumer Advocate suggests that "given the many significant changes, pending proceedings, as well as the timing of the filing of HECO's IRP-3, the public interest would be better served if this matter is reviewed carefully in a

3

²Consumer Advocate's Preliminary Statement of Position, filed on July 7, 2005.

³Presently, the due date for the filing of HECO's IRP-3 is early October 2005.

⁴The commission approved the IRP Framework in Decision and Order No. 11630, filed on May 22, 1997, in Docket No. 6617.

procedural schedule that is coordinated with the review conducted in other relevant docketed matters."⁵

HECO, in response, recommends the commission: (1) deny the Consumer Advocate's request to suspend this docket; (2) deny Consumer Advocate's request to establish a procedural the schedule that starts after HECO's IRP-3 filing; and (3) deny any request to consolidate this docket with Docket No. 05-0146.6 further notes that while it does not object to the HECO suspension of the 90-day Review Period, provided that said suspension does not unduly delay this proceeding, " HECO objects the Consumer Advocate's suggestion that the commission to indefinitely suspend Docket No. 05-0145. HECO: (1) emphasizes that the need for this additional generation was demonstrated in its 2004 and 2005 Adequacy of Supply reports to the commission and its IRP-2 filing; and (2) suggests that the draft IRP-3 supports the need for additional generation and the Proposed Project, in particular.

Upon our review, we find good cause to suspend the instant Application in order to thoroughly review the Proposed

⁵Consumer Advocate's Preliminary Statement of Position at 4.

4

⁶HECO's Memorandum in Response, filed on July 26, 2005, to the Consumer Advocate's Preliminary Position Statement ("HECO's Response"). HECO's capital expenditure application in Docket No. 05-0146, filed on the same day as its Application in Docket No. 05-0145, requests the commission approval: (1) to commit funds for the Reverse Osmosis Water Pipeline Project, from Campbell Industrial Park to HECO's Kahe Power Plant, and the Environmental Monitoring Project; and (2) of other related matters.

⁷HECO recognizes "that it would be impractical to complete the docket within the 90-day [R]eview [P]eriod." HECO's Response at 13.

Project in the context of HECO's forthcoming IRP-3 filing. Accordingly, the commission suspends HECO's Application, including the 90-day Review Period, until further order of the commission.⁸

III.

<u>Orders</u>

THE COMMISSION ORDERS that HECO's Application, filed on June 17, 2005, including the 90-day Review Period established pursuant to Paragraph 2.3.g.2 of General Order No. 7, is suspended until further order of the commission.

DONE at Honolulu, Hawaii _____ SEP 1 4 2005_____

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

Bv

Carlito P. Caliboso, Chairman

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

(EXCUSED) By_ Waxne H. Kimura, Commissioner Kawelo, Čommissioner

Catherine P. Awakuni Commission Counsel

05-0145.eh

⁸The commission intends to rule on the pending intervention requests in a later Order. The suspension of this docket does not toll the deadline to timely file a motion to intervene or participate, which expired on July 7, 2005.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this date served a copy of the foregoing Order No. 22030 upon the following parties, by causing a copy hereof to be mailed, postage prepaid, and properly addressed to each such party.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS DIVISION OF CONSUMER ADVOCACY P. O. Box 541 96809 Honolulu, HI

WILLIAM A. BONNET VICE PRESIDENT - GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. P. O. Box 2750 Honolulu, HI 96840-0001

DEAN MATSUURA DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. P. O. Box 2750 Honolulu, HI 96840-0001

CRAIG I. NAKANISHI, ESQ. RUSH MOORE LLP 737 Bishop Street, Suite 2400 Honolulu, HI 96813

THOMAS W. WILLIAMS, ESQ. PETER Y. KIKUTA, ESQ. GOODSILL ANDERSON QUINN & STIFEL Alii Place, Suite 1800 1099 Alakea Street Honolulu, HI 96813

Karen Higashi

DATED: SEP 1 4 2005