



PJM Analysis



CCPPSTF August 2, 2017

www.pjm.com



- 1. State Actions
- 2. Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example
- 3. State Actions Impact on Key RPM Components
- 4. Effect of Low Offer Prices on Clearing Prices



- 1. State Actions
- 2. Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example
- 3. State Actions Impact on Key RPM Components
- 4. Effect of Low Offer Prices on Clearing Prices

Contents



Key State Actions Identified in KWA #2

- 1. Renewable Portfolio Standards (Credits vary in different States)
- 2. Emission Tax (Not applicable in PJM)
- 3. Cap-and-Trade (Penalties for fossil generation in DE and MD)
- 4. Feed-in Tariff (Not applicable in PJM)
- 5. Mandated Power Purchase Agreements (Applicable in MI; Difficult to quantify)
- 6. Zero Emission Credits (e.g. Credits to nuclear generation in IL)
- 7. Loan Programs (Not applicable in PJM)
- 8. Grant Programs (Not applicable in PJM)
- 9. Tax Incentives (Various; small credits)
- 10. State Takeover (Not applicable in PJM)
- 11. Rate Based Cost Recovery for Certain Resources (including varying credits to EE and DR) See CCPPSTF Matrix tab "KWA #2" for details.



- 1. Potential credits to some resources due to State Actions were quantified. The credits vary widely in value depending on the State. See CCPPSTF Matrix tab KWA #3 Quantification for details. PJM does not have data to quantify credits due to Rate Based Cost Recovery.
- 2. The following three State Actions could potentially have a significant impact on resource economics.
 - Renewable Portfolio Standards
 - Zero Emission Credits
 - Rate Based Cost Recovery (for certain resources)



1. State Actions

見

- 2. Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example
- 3. State Actions Impact on Key RPM Components
- 4. Effect of Low Offer Prices on Clearing Prices

Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example

PJM has no data to illustrate credits due to Rate Based Cost Recovery.

	Fixed Cost *	Net Energy Revenue **	Revenue Shortfall	Potential Credit Examples ***	State Action
Solar-New	\$1,578	\$350	\$1,229	\$2490; \$66	NJ, OH RPS
Wind-New	\$4,225	\$1,181	\$3,044	\$277; \$39	NJ, OH RPS
Nuclear-Existing-EPA	\$564	\$458	\$106	\$265	IL ZEC
	\$564	\$374	\$190	\$265	IL ZEC
	\$564	\$682	-\$118	\$265	IL ZEC
Nuclear-Existing-NEI	\$640	\$458	\$182	\$265	IL ZEC
	\$640	\$374	\$266	\$265	IL ZEC
	\$640	\$682	-\$41	\$265	IL ZEC
All data converted to \$/NAW day UCAD basis using tunical UCAD to nominal conspirity ratio					

All data converted to \$/MW-day UCAP basis using typical UCAP to nominal capacity ratio.

* Solar and wind fixed costs are from 2016 SoM report.

EPA nuclear fixed cost is from EPA data: 2011 costs escalated to 2016 at 2%/year. Range \$350-\$700/MW-day.

NEI nuclear fixed cost is from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI): 2015 costs escalated to 2016 at 2%/year. A 90% capacity factor is assumed in converting \$/MWh cost to fixed cost.

Cost varies depending on whether it is a single unit or multi-unit site.

** Net energy revenues are from 2016 SoM report for new capacity: PJM value and lowest and highest zonal values are shown.

*** Potential credits are from KWA #3 Quantification (see CCPPSTF Matrix).



- 1. State Actions
- 2. Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example
- 3. State Actions Impact on Key RPM Components
- 4. Effect of Low Offer Prices on Clearing Prices



- Significant credits to resources may result in lower offers from these resources and suppress market clearing prices when the resources receiving the credits are not economic
 - Detrimental effect to merchant assets wholly dependent on the wholesale market
- Pushes out the economic entrant
 - New, more efficient, resources are kept out of the market by maintaining uneconomic resources



Administrative

- RTO/LDA Reliability Requirement (BTMG may have some impact)
- Net Cost of New Entry (Possible secondary impact of energy market changes; energy market not in scope)
- Sloped VRR Curve

Specific Tariff Requirement

- Market Power Mitigation
- MOPR for new generation

Auction Clearing Constraints

- Locational (transmission related)
- Resource Caps (reliability related)

Delivery Year Performance



RPM Components that May Be Impacted by State Actions

Supply

- Offer Prices/Competition *
- Forward Commitment *
- Non-Discriminatory Selection *

Auction Clearing

- Locational Price Signals *
- Revenue Adequacy *
- Centralized Market/Price Transparency *

Delivery Year Load Charges

* The RPM components that are potentially impacted by State Actions may need a special treatment to minimize the impact.



- 1. State Actions
- 2. Revenue Shortfall vs. Credits from State Actions: Example
- 3. State Actions Impact on Key RPM Components
- 4. Effect of Low Offer Prices on Clearing Prices



- The clearing price impact of uncompetitive sell offers has been estimated using the 2020/2021 BRA scenario analysis results
- The price impact is greater if the uncompetitive sell offers are confined to a smaller constrained sub-region of the RTO as opposed to being distributed evenly throughout the RTO
 - the estimated price impact for the constrained EMAAC LDA is \$4.34/MW -day per each 100 MW of subsidized capacity located in the EMAAC area (using delta of EMAAC RCPs from scenarios 6 & 7 divided by total change in EMAAC supply in these cases of 3,258 MW)
 - The estimated price impact for the RTO Region is \$0.26/MW-day per each 100 MW of subsidized capacity distributed throughout the rest of RTO region (using delta of RTO RCPs from scenarios 2 & 3 divided by total change in RTO supply in these cases of 6,000 MW)