



**PJM Interconnection
Load Analysis Subcommittee
Minutes of the 290th Meeting
Conference Call
January 4, 2011**

Members Present:

John Reynolds, Chairman	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
Debbie Kanner	Allegheny Power
Randy E. Holliday	American Electric Power
Dennis Kelter	Commonwealth Edison (Exelon)
Bill Moll	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Timothy Devitt	PECO Energy Company
Ayana Wood	UGI Utilities, Inc.
Molly Mooney, Secretary	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Others Present:

Jeff Brown	American Electric Power
Leon Brunson	Baltimore Gas & Electric Company
James Jablonski	Borough of Lavallette, New Jersey
Guy Filomena	Customized Energy Solutions
Hertzel Shamash	Dayton Power & Light Company
Audrey Lyke	Exelon Generation Co., L.L.C.
Scott Everngam	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Jonathan Fernandez	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Valerie Martin	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Tony Lindeman	FirstEnergy Solutions Corporation
Michael Stansky	FirstEnergy Solutions Corporation
Mark Hanson	Illinois Commerce Commission
James Wilson	Independent Consultant
Sean Boyle	NextEra Energy Power Marketing, LLC
Yasmin Snowberger	PA PUC
Willa Hightower	PECO Energy Company
Mark Meacham	PPL Electric Utilities
Jim Hebson	PSEG Energy Resources and Trade L.L.C.
Bryan Mills	PSEG Energy Resources and Trade L.L.C.
Mike Batta	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Yashodhan Dongre	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Sid Hays	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Abhijit Rajan	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Bob Thomas	Virginia Electric & Power Company
John J. Slivka	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
Jennifer Warner-Freeman	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.



1. ADMINISTRATIVE

PJM took attendance. Mr. Reynolds summarized a few items that were discussed at the December 22nd conference call. A request for the Weather Normalized numbers was made and these numbers will be added to the data spreadsheet posted along with the load report. The executive summary will not include a comment about the Itron report. PJM management has declined the request to provide a separate load forecast with the Itron recommendations and asked that this kind of request be taken up at the Planning Committee meeting.

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the December 22, 2010 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Jablonski asked that more be added to the minutes as far as PJM management's reasons for not incorporating any of the Itron recommendations. The revisions will be made to the minutes and final minutes will be posted to the LAS webpage.

3. REVISED 2011 PJM LOAD REPORT

Mr. Reynolds said the revised 2011 draft load report is based on the Moody's December release. There were two fixes to the initial draft report. The first fix is to round the Weather Normalized NCP value for Dominion to the nearest ten. The second fix applies to PECO energy in table E1 where the data for PEPCO was used by mistake. The model specifics are an estimation period of 1/1/1998 – 8/31/2010, weather from 1973 – 2009, Dominion uses GMPs for the economic driver, and Duke uses Cincinnati weather and GMP.

The group was then asked for any comments or questions. Mr. Hurd from Dayton raised a concern with the Dayton forecast. His concern is that the forecast is down in most zones but is significantly up in the Dayton zone. He also mentioned that an independent forecast done by Itron for them had an approximate 1% growth for peak load and annual sales compared to 1.5% growth shown in the PJM draft load report. PJM will follow up with Dayton and Moody's regarding this concern.

Mr. Wilson asked about the Demand Response (DR) shown in the report. Mr. Reynolds responded that the DR shown is the DR that has cleared in RPM auctions.

Mr. Rajan asked about the Weather Normalized number for Dominion and why it did not change in the most recent draft load report. Mr. Reynolds responded that we did not update weather normalized numbers because of the December economics since we needed these earlier than the forecast. The weather normalized value for the DOM zone were based on models using GMP not GSP.

Mr. Jablonski mentioned that the Dayton concern could be instructional in the sense that a change in the GMP from Moody's had a big impact on the Dayton load forecast. He said that if PJM had used Itron's recommendations #1 and #3 this may have been avoided. Mr. Reynolds answered that it is not necessarily the case that one follows from the other. Mr. Jablonski said that using only Moody's could have caused a larger than expected increase while using an average of Moody's and Global Insight could have avoided this.



Mr. Hurd brought up a concern with Dayton's 2010 weather normalized value. He said Dayton experienced extreme Cooling Degree Days (CDD) compared to normal, but their WN value was up compared to the actual summer peak, and this may be a reason that the Dayton load forecast. Mr. Reynolds noted that while degree days were quite high, peak day weather conditions were not, and that WN values are not used as the starting point to grow the forecast..

4. NEXT STEPS

PJM plans to post the revised forecast by the end of the week after follow up with Dayton and Moody's. The Planning Committee will discuss further evaluation of the Itron recommendations on Thursday, Jan. 6th.

Author: Molly A. Mooney
DMS Document Number: 627924