

PJM Analysis of the EPA Clean Power Plan

PJM Interconnection October 6, 2016

PJM©2016



PJM CPP Study Objectives

Evaluate potential impacts to:

- Resource adequacy
- Transmission system operations
- PJM energy and capacity market prices

Determine compliance costs

The results are not a forecast, but are a function of assumptions



PJM as Part of the Eastern Interconnection





Historic and Current Context for Understanding PJM's Analysis of the Clean Power Plan

Natural Gas Rig Productivity Rises and Prices Decline

Rig Productivity Henry Hub Historic Monthly Price (mcf/rig/day) 12,000 16 Marcellus 14 Eagle Ford Haynesville 10,000 -Niobrara -Bakken 12 -Permian 8,000 10 8 6,000 6 4,000 4 2,000 2 0 Jan 2016 Jan 10 * Source: EIA. Drilling Productivity * Source: EIA. Henry Hub Report. September 2016. Monthly Spot Price Series September 25, 2016.



Demand has Been Declining in the PJM Region



Gas is Gaining Prominence in the Energy Mix



the Market Report for PJM. August 11, 2016.



Source: PJM Generation Attributes Tracking System. 2016 data is through July.



jm

1

Key Model Features





Mass-Based Compliance Pathway Scenarios

Trade-Ready



Single CO₂ limit applied to the PJM region for 111(d) existing resources

State Mass

Existing

Each state applies a CO₂ limit covering all 111(d) existing resources

New Source Complement



Single CO₂ limit applied to the PJM region for 111(d) existing and 111(b) new sources

State Mass New Source Complement



Each state applies a CO₂ limit covering all 111(d) existing resources and 111(b) new sources

> [1] <u>Proposed Federal Plan for the Clean Power Plan (PDF)</u> http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-10-23/pdf/2015-22848.pdf



Rate-Based Compliance Pathway Scenarios

Regional Blended Rate

Trade-Ready Rate



Emissions performance measured against the sub-category CO₂ emission rate targets for combined cycle and steam turbine resources New S/ERC Existing

Emissions performance measured against a weighted average of PJM states' CO₂ emissions rate targets

State Blended Rate



Emissions performance measured against the state CO₂ emissions rate target

[1] <u>Proposed Federal Plan for the Clean Power Plan (PDF)</u> http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-10-23/pdf/2015-22848.pdf

PJM's Analysis of the Clean Power Plan:

m

1

Key Findings from Reference Gas Scenario









*Analysis focused on transmission limitations in 2025 at the 230 kV system and up. Limited set of 138 kV or below constraints evaluated.

Energy Market Prices Increase Over-Time in Response to Higher Fuel Cost, Load Growth and Emissions Market Prices





Capacity Market Prices Increase to Offset Resource Retirements and Load Growth









Īm

Security Constrained Economic Dispatch Virginia 2025









Virginia's Energy Mix in 2025





im

Low Gas Price Sensitivity Short-Term Retirement Decision Sensitivity



Henry Hub Natural Gas Price Comparison



Source: IHS Inc.

The use of this content was authorized in advance by IHS. Any further use or redistribution of this content is strictly prohibited without written permission by IHS. All rights reserved.

If Gas Prices Remain Low... Compliance with CPP Mass Targets are not Binding











Key Observations and Conclusions

- 1. It is feasible for the PJM states to comply with the CPP and do so with compliance costs between 1.1%-3.3% of current total wholesale costs.
- 2. Resource adequacy is maintained, but with a shift from coal and other fossil steam generation to new combined cycle natural gas and renewable generation.
- 3. Compliance with the Clean Power Plan leads to lower transmission congestion overall and shifting of congestion patterns relative to the reference case but transmission reliability studies are ongoing.
- 4. Mass-based, trade-ready compliance leads to the lowest compliance costs.



Key Observations and Conclusions

- 5. If natural gas prices remain low as they have been in the past several years, the PJM states would achieve or exceed the EPA mass-based emission reduction goals even in the absence of the Clean Power Plan
- 6. Shortening the retirement decision horizon to a 5 year window leads to nuclear retirements and an increase in compliance costs with reference case gas prices, with compliance costs remaining below 2% of current total wholesale costs for the model scenarios examined.