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Leon Brunson - Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
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Bill Moll - FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
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1. **ADMINISTRATIVE**

PJM took attendance and asked for any additional agenda items.

2. **MINUTES**

The December 6, 2012 meeting minutes were reviewed, marked as final, and will be posted.

3. **2013 MID-YEAR LOAD FORECAST UPDATE**

Mr. Gledhill presented the mid-year forecast update which is meant to better inform RPM market participants between auctions and is done in response to a Brattle report recommendation. The forecast update is not used in PJM planning studies or as an input in auction parameters. An updated economic forecast from June 2013 was used to re-estimate and reforecast models. The mid-year forecast for the RTO is up slightly from the official 2013 forecast. The only zone with a noticeable difference in the updated forecast is AE which went down about 2% because of an economic restatement downward.

4. **SUMMER 2013 PEAK LOAD EXPERIENCE**

Mr. Reynolds updated the subcommittee on PJM loads from July 15th to the 19th. PJM initiated load management on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday in ATSI on all three days and PECO, PL and a part of AEP on Thursday. The estimates of load management on these days are estimates of PJM-initiated reductions. There will probably be more load management that was done for economic reasons and will show up as addbacks in October. PJM noted that the preliminary loads are metered loads shown on an unrestricted peak distribution from the 2013 forecast. Heat Index values are also preliminary as final weather data was not available yet.
Ms. Warner-Freeman gave an update on the PJM driven load forecast model development. The testing procedure using Metrix and SAS was discussed along with model fit statistics that were reviewed. PJM is working within the current model structure on daytype, weather and economic variables.

There was discussion from the subcommittee on a number of items, including the six month forward forecast that when comparing the weather normalized peak to the December forecast, the forecast has been high. PJM does not believe there is a structural problem with the economic variable but that the economy has underperformed compared to the economic forecast. Another question relating to the price shift variable test is how PJM will forecast price shifts. PJM responded that price shifts would not be forecasted but would be held constant throughout the forecast, similar to the way load adjustments are treated. Another topic brought up was the estimation period used in modeling and if it is too long and therefore missing possible new trends in peak usage behavior. PJM responded that they have routinely looked at varying the estimation period every forecast and, although a shorter time period may give better model fit statistics, it produces an unstable forecast. PJM also cautioned against using an estimation time frame that does not include a period of stable growth. The subcommittee was queried on the time period used in their forecast models. From those who responded, estimation start years ranged from 1980 to 2004. It was noted that the 2004 start year had to do with poor quality of data prior to 2004.

The next steps will be to present materials related to the model development to the Planning Committee and discuss how changes would be implemented and rolled out in production. The areas where PJM believes should be examined further are weather splines and refining the indexed economic term.