

410

411 **Q. How has the Company projected peak loads, and what is the relationship between**
412 **these projections and the load research data?**

413 A. The Company has forecasted the timing and amount of monthly Utah total peak loads
414 using its jurisdictional forecast methodology, which also forecasts the day and hour of
415 each month's peak. Ideally, the sum of class peak loads that are projected from the load
416 research data should equal the jurisdictional forecast of total load. The projections
417 calculated from the load research data did not closely match the forecast peaks, and in
418 some cases were off by over 20%. Specific problem months were October 2009 (13%
419 difference), December 2009 (12% difference), March 2010 (12% difference), April 2010
420 (8% difference) and May 2010 (21% difference). Furthermore, the peaks calculated from
421 the load research data and the peaks calculated from the jurisdictional forecasts often
422 differed in timing by as much as 22 days during these months.

423

424 **Q. Did the Workgroup address how the load research data estimates of peak loads**
425 **should be adjusted to meet the system forecast peaks?**

426 A. The Workgroup "**considered adjustment of the load research data, and some of the**
427 **parties**" approved a stepped adjustment process, whereby the Company would weather-
428 normalize the load research data, choose new peak hours for cases where the load research
429 data differed from the jurisdictional data by more than 10%, and then if there was still a
430 difference of more than 5%, further adjust the peaks by a "calibrating adjustment." The
431 Company followed this procedure, with the exception that it did not weather-normalize loads.