

5. Volumetric Forecast

References: Exhibit 3 pages 104 – 111

Decision Chapleau PUC EB-2007-0755

Decision and Order on Licence Amendments and CDM Targets,
EB-201-0215/EB2010-0216

The Board noted in CPUC's 2008 costs of service Decision that CPUC is to clearly present and fully substantiate its customer number forecast and a weather normalized load forecast in its application. The Board went on to say that it expects CPUC's next application to show substantial improvement in this area.

Board staff is having difficulties understanding CPUC's forecast. CPUC states on page 102 that the load forecast for the 2012 Test Year is the average of actual historical data from 2006 to 2010 was used. CPUC also stated that, for the Bridge Year, actual data to August 2011 was used and September to December was forecast based on the average monthly consumptions 2008 to 2010. Board staff would like to understand this forecast better. Table 1 is a summary of the monthly average demand per customer/connection.

- a. When CPUC states that the average of actual historical data from 2006 to 2010 was used, Board staff would like to clarify that the 2012 forecast was built up from the granular level of average monthly volumes by customer/connection. Please confirm that this is correct. If this is not correct, please explain how the forecast was developed.

Table 1
Average Customer Monthly Demand (kWh/Cust/Mos)

		Chapleau PUC EB-2011-0322						
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
1	Residential	1,075	1,080	1,046	1,093	1,112	1,061	1,072
2	GS,50 kW	2,905	2,851	2,750	2,629	2,675	2,643	2,720
3	GS > 50 kW	43,928	46,074	46,345	47,192	46,854	43,851	45,589
4	USL	101	101	97	101	100	101	101
5	Sentinel Lights	81	79	83	84	101	94	94
6	Street Lightnig.	59	72	72	72	73	72	72
7	Total	1,407	1,394	1,370	1,400	1,414	1,352	1,383

Board staff has developed the following tables based on the data.

Table 2
Variance
Average Customer Monthly Demand (kWh/Cust/Mos)
Chapleau PUC EB-2011-0322

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10
	07/08	08/07	09/08	10/09	11/10	12/11	Avg.	Max.	Min	Range
1 Residential	5	-34	47	20	-51	11	-1	47	-51	98
2 GS,50 kW	-54	-101	-120	45	-31	77	-31	77	-120	197
3 GS > 50 kW	2,146	271	847	-338	-3,003	1,738	277	2,146	-3,003	5,149
4 USL	1	-4	4	-1	0	0	0	4	-4	8
5 Sentinel Lights	-2	3	1	17	-7	0	2	17	-7	24
6 Street Lightnig.	13	0	0	0	-1	0	2	13	-1	14

Table 3
Variance
Average Customer Monthly Demand (%)
Chapleau PUC EB-2011-0322

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10
	07/08	08/07	09/08	10/09	11/10	12/11	Avg.	Max.	Min	Range
1 Residential	0.5%	-3.1%	4.5%	1.8%	-4.6%	1.0%	0.0%	4.5%	-4.6%	9.1%
2 GS,50 kW	-1.9%	-3.5%	-4.4%	1.7%	-1.2%	2.9%	-1.1%	2.9%	-4.4%	7.3%
3 GS > 50 kW	4.9%	0.6%	1.8%	-0.7%	-6.4%	4.0%	0.7%	4.9%	-6.4%	11.3%
4 USL	0.5%	-4.0%	4.4%	-1.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	4.4%	-4.0%	8.5%
5 Sentinel Lights	-1.9%	4.3%	1.2%	20.4%	-6.6%	-0.3%	2.8%	20.4%	-6.6%	27.0%
6 Street Lightnig.	22.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	-1.0%	0.3%	3.7%	22.3%	-1.0%	23.3%

Table 2 is the year over year variance in the average monthly kWh by class found on Table 1. Table 3 expresses the variances in Table 2 as a percentage. In both tables, Col. 7 – Col. 10 are descriptive statistics on the variability of the variances. Col. 7 is the average of the observed variance in Col. 1 - 6. Col. 10 is the range in which the actual value varies, and is calculated from the Maximums and Minimums in Col. 8 and 9.

Board staff feels that the year over year variability seen in the data is large.

- b. Please confirm that CPUC agrees with the variances in tables, and provide an explanation for the variability of the average monthly kWh per customer/connect.
- c. Please file a weather normalized kWh forecast.
- d. Please provide the CDM savings that were proposed in CPUC's last Board approved load forecast.
- e. Please explain how CPUC has considered the historical CDM in setting the 2012 forecast.
- f. The Board in its Decision and Order on Licence Amendments and CDM Targets set 2011 – 2014 CDM targets for CPUC of Net Cumulative 2011-2014

energy savings of 1.210 GWh, and a 2014 net annual peak savings of 0.170 MW. Please explain how these targets are incorporated into the 2012 forecast.

- g. If CPUC has not done so, please update the proposed load forecast with a CDM reduction included that represents 20% of Chapleau's energy consumption target of 1.210 GWh (0.242 GWh).