

1 **TOPIC:** **TESTIMONY REFERENCES**

2 **PREAMBLE:**

3 Page 10: “Prior to 2003, the effect of the load variation provision was that each customer class
4 was at risk from load changes in all classes (for IC, load changes in other individual IC
5 members, plus NP load changes). Interveners in that proceeding objected to this risk
6 distribution...”

7 **QUESTION:**

8 Which intervenor(s) in the above proceeding objected to the mechanics of the load variation
9 provision under the pre-2003 methods, and in what form did they object (testimony, etc.)? Also
10 explain the basis for the objection.

11 **RESPONSE:**

12 The record of intervenors individual positions is not available, as the matter was settled by
13 negotiation and did not proceed to the argument stage of the hearing. Please refer to the response
14 to CA-IC-1.

15 In terms of expert evidence, Mr. P. Bowman’s evidence in 2003 objected to the risk distribution
16 in that load variation risk is a risk appropriately borne by the utility.