Exh. DCG-11
Dockets UE-170485/UG-170486
Witness: David C. Gomez

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, **Complainant,** **v.** **AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a AVISTA UTILITIES,** **Respondent.**	**DOCKETS UE-170485 and UG-170486 (*Consolidated*)**

EXHIBIT TO
TESTIMONY OF

David C. Gomez

STAFF OF
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Avista's Response to Staff DR No. 151

October 27, 2017

AVISTA CORP.
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

JURISDICTION:	WASHINGTON	DATE PREPARED:	08/28/2017
CASE NO:	UE-170485 & UG-170486	WITNESS:	Clint Kalich
REQUESTER:	David Gomez	RESPONDER:	Clint Kalich
TYPE:	Data Request	DEPT:	Energy Resources
REQUEST NO.:	UTC_Staff_151	TELEPHONE:	(509) 495-4532
		EMAIL:	clint.kalich@avistacorp.com

REQUEST:

Referring to the workpaper of Mr. Clint Kalich titled Load Table_2017-19.xlsx, describe how Mr. Kalich arrived at the hourly load shapes "% of month" for the pro forma periods used in the AURORA model using actual 2016 hourly load data in the worksheet tab titled 2016 Actual.

Explain why the "% of Month" is based on 2016 actual hourly data and not normalized to account for inter-year hourly temperature and weather variation.

RESPONSE:

Please see Avista's **CONFIDENTIAL** response to data request Staff_DR_151C. Please note that Avista's response to Staff_DR_151C is **Confidential per Protective Order in UTC Dockets UE-170485 and UG-170486**.

Avista loads included in AURORA are weather normalized on a monthly basis, but use test year hourly load levels using the test year load shapes. These load shapes are calculated using the test period hourly loads and calculating the hourly load shape by dividing the hourly load by the monthly average load.

Weather normalization is not performed on an hourly, or even daily basis. Hourly load weatherization would not be very accurate to do such analysis on an hourly basis as it would remove weather variation within the month. Instead we perform monthly weather normalization and reduce each hour's load level by its share of the monthly normalization value. Therefore the 2016 hourly shapes remain the same and are used in the proforma consistent with the data and with previous cases.

During review of the load data in the initial filing, Avista discovered the loads are incorrect due to an incorrect accounting for 2016 being a leap year. The load calculation worksheet was not modified to include the extra day. Therefore this error affects monthly load levels in February and December, and also impacts the hourly load shape after February. The table below should replace Table No. 2- Historical Loads in Kalich's direct testimony (CGK-1T). In addition, Staff_DR_151C Confidential Attachment A - Load Table_2017-19_Fixed.xlsx is provided with the corrected data. Avista conducted a study in the AURORA model with this change, the results of this study is an increase of power costs of $392,522 system. In addition the following files are included in Staff_DR_151C Confidential Attachment B. They are AURORA input, output, and proforma result files including the corrected load data.

AVA_WA_2018-2019_GRC_DR_151_Archive.zip
AVA_WA_GRC_2018-19_Filed Case with Load Adjustment.xdb
XDB WA 2018-19 Filing_80 Years_Test_Year_Load.xlsx

Due to the size of these reports, they are being provided in electronic format only.

Month	Actual Load	Weather Adjustment	Modeled Load		Month	Actual Load	Weather Adjustment	Modeled Load
May-18	910.0	29.0	939.0		Nov-18	1,018.3	55.7	1,074.0
Jun-18	979.6	-35.7	944.0		Dec-18	1,284.7	-49.4	1,235.4
Jul-18	1,017.9	31.2	1,049.1		Jan-19	1,187.2	18.7	1,205.9
Aug-18	1,063.2	-25.2	1,038.0		Feb-19	1,091.5	51.8	1,143.3
Sep-18	918.0	23.4	941.4		Mar-19	1,021.8	28.0	1,049.8
Oct-18	952.3	4.4	956.6		Apr-19	921.2	50.4	971.6