

# 2015 Independent Load Forecast – Workshop #1

January 22, 2015

# Purpose

- Obtain feedback regarding potential areas of improvement/analysis in Year 2
- It is not our intention to simply repeat the Year 1 process with new data
- Stakeholder input is very important at this stage

# Potential Areas

- We have come up with a number of things that we could look at in Year 2 based on discussions over the past year
- These are only intended to be a starting point
- If you have an idea for something you want us to look into, let us know

# Multiple Weather Stations

- In the state econometric models we tried to select a single weather station that was indicative of the state's weather for annual CDD and HDD
- Suggestions were made that we use multiple weather stations
- Annual CDD and HDD data for multiple weather stations within a state may be highly correlated, resulting in multicollinearity

# Correlations

## Correlation with Houston

	CDD	HDD
San Antonio	0.68	0.89
Dallas	0.77	0.90

## Correlation with Indianapolis

	CDD	HDD
South Bend	0.83	0.85
Evansville	0.87	0.93

## EE/DR/DG

- In Year 1, we based our EE adjustments on state requirements
- This year, Applied Energy Group is doing a study of EE/DR/DG
- We hope to be able to utilize their work as the basis for the Year 2 adjustments

# Louisiana CHP

- Despite expected robust economic growth, the Louisiana econometric model projected modest retail sales growth (0.47% CAGR)
- This occurred because most of the growth in industrial output in Louisiana has resulted in increased self-generation instead of increased retail sales

# Louisiana CHP

- Historically, industrial CHP has grown at double the rate of all retail sales and quadruple the rate of industrial retail sales
- Thus, industrial output is disconnected from retail sales (we were unable to produce a model formulation that used GSP as a driver)



# Louisiana CHP

- If we use sales + CHP as our dependent variable, we were able to produce a model that uses GSP as a driver
  - this model has not been vetted by stakeholders
- This model produces a CAGR of 1.70%, which is more in line with what might be expected

## $(\text{Sales} + \text{CHP}) - \text{CHP}?$

- In theory, one could produce separate models that would project sales+CHP and just CHP and the difference would be sales
- But how does one project CHP in a non-arbitrary fashion?

# Forecasts using Alternate Assumptions

- If there is interest, we could examine the impact of alternative assumptions on the forecast
  - e.g., if compliance with the EPA's 111(d) rule results in higher prices and/or changed economic growth, what would the effect be on the load forecast?

# Sector-specific Forecasts

- The use of public data sources precludes the development of sector-specific (residential, commercial, industrial) forecasts
  - there is not enough possible drivers with public historical data sources
- Thus, this would force us to move away from public sources to proprietary sources

# IHS Global Insight Data

- IHS Global Insight provides historical data for a number of potential drivers
- Residential – households, housing starts, disposable income, etc.
- Commercial – non-manufacturing employment/GSP, etc.
- Industrial – manufacturing GSP, etc.

# Sector-specific Forecasts

- This would be a significant effort
  - 45 econometric models vs. 15
- Usefulness may be limited
  - Ideally, the differences between growth in the sectors can be used to drive peak demand growth, but we lack the information necessary to do that

# Confidence Intervals

- Year 1 confidence intervals were based on the statistical bands associated with the state econometric models
- The applicability of those bands depends on the degree of correlation of the errors between state models
- We are looking into a seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) formulation

# Confidence Intervals

- These do not capture uncertainty surrounding the macroeconomic projections
- IHS Global Insight can provide optimistic/pessimistic macroeconomic projections but they do not assign probabilities to these
  - These would cost extra



# Peak Conversions

- LRZ level energy to peak conversions (winter and summer) were based on a linear relationship between temperature and load for the 10 highest load hours for the season for the 4 years for which we had data
- We could look into a more sophisticated regression using additional data points

# Coincidence Factors

- Summer peak coincidence factors were provided by MISO
- Winter peak coincidence factors were calculated using averages of observations
- While data is a limiting factor, we could look into near-peak coincidence and/or weather conditions at time of peak to see if it provides value

# Additional Statistical Issues

- Multicollinearity
- Non-stationarity