2019 State of the Market Report for PJM

Press Briefing March 12, 2020 Joe Bowring



Market Monitoring Unit

- Monitoring Analytics, LLC
 - Independent company
 - Formed August 1, 2008
- Independent Market Monitor for PJM
 - Independent from Market Participants
 - Independent from RTO management
 - Independent from RTO board of managers
- MMU Accountability
 - To FERC (per FERC MMU Orders and MM Plan)
 - To PJM markets
 - **To PJM Board for administration of the contract**



Role of Market Monitoring

- Market monitoring is required by FERC Orders
- Role of competition under FERC regulation
 - Mechanism to regulate prices
 - **Competitive outcome = just and reasonable**
- FERC has enforcement authority
- Relevant model of competition is not laissez faire
- Competitive outcomes are not automatic
- Detailed rules required
- Detailed monitoring required:
 - Of participants
 - Of RTO
 - Of rules



Role of Market Monitoring

- Market monitoring functions:
 - Reporting
 - Market design
 - Monitoring
- Market monitoring is primarily analytical
 - Adequacy of market rules
 - Compliance with market rules
 - Exercise of market power
 - Market manipulation
- Market monitoring provides inputs to prospective mitigation
- Market monitoring provides retrospective mitigation



PJM's footprint and its 21 control zones



- Allegheny Power Company (APS)
 American Electric Power Co., Inc (AEP)
 American Transmission Systems, Inc. (ATSI)
 Atlantic Electric Company (AECO)
 Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE)
 ComEd
 Dayton Power and Light Company (DAY)
 Delmarva Power and Light (DPL)
 - Dominion
 - Duke Energy Ohio/Kentucky (DEOK)
- Duquesne Light (DLCO)
 Eastern Kentucky Power Cooperative (EKPC)
 Jersey Central Power and Light Company (JCPL)
 Metropolitan Edison Company (Met-Ed)
 Ohio Valley Electric Corporation (OVEC)
 PECO Energy (PECO)
 Pennsylvania Electric Company (PENELEC)
 Pepco
 PPL Electric Utilities (PPL)
 Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSEG)
 - Rockland Electric Company (RECO)



The energy market results were competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure: Aggregate Market	Partially Competitive	
Market Structure: Local Market	Not Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Competitive	
Market Performance	Competitive	Effective



Monitoring Analytics

Recommendations: Energy Market

- Correct flaws in implementation of market power mitigation rules:
 - Cost-based offers equal to short run marginal cost
 - Clear definitions for cost-based offers in Manual 15
 - Clear definition of relevant operating expenses
 - Fuel cost policies: algorithmic, verifiable, systematic
- Parameter limited schedules should use the most flexible parameters and be applied whenever a resource fails the TPS test or operates under an emergency or alert.
- Review and use accurate transmission line ratings.
- Real time dispatch and pricing should be more transparent and follow a rule based, scheduled approach.
- Prioritize and implement more accurate generator modelling, combined cycle modelling and soak time.
- Penalty for misuse of real time values for parameters



Monitoring Analytics

Average hourly seasonal real-time supply curve



Total price per MWh by category

	2018	2018	2018	2019	2019	2019	
Category	\$/MWh	(\$ Millions)	Percent of Total	\$/MWh	(\$ Millions)	Percent of Total	Percent Change
Load Weighted Energy	\$24.65	\$19,498	61.4%	\$17.28	\$13,337	54.3%	(29.9%)
Capacity	\$8.37	\$6,624	20.9%	\$7.13	\$5,506	22.4%	(14.8%)
Capacity	\$8.34	\$6,600	20.8%	\$7.12	\$5,497	22.4%	(14.6%)
Capacity (FRR)	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	0.0%
Capacity (RMR)	\$0.03	\$24	0.1%	\$0.01	\$9	0.0%	(62.7%)
Transmission	\$6.10	\$4,823	15.2%	\$6.57	\$5,069	20.6%	7.7%
Transmission Service Charges	\$5.67	\$4,483	14.1%	\$6.16	\$4,756	19.4%	8.7%
Transmission Enhancement Cost Recovery	\$0.37	\$292	0.9%	\$0.35	\$270	1.1%	(5.4%)
Transmission Owner (Schedule 1A)	\$0.06	\$48	0.2%	\$0.06	\$43	0.2%	(6.8%)
Transmission Seams Elimination Cost Assignment (SECA)	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	0.0%
Transmission Facility Charges	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	0.0%
Ancillary	\$0.51	\$407	1.3%	\$0.46	\$352	1.4%	(11.2%)
Reactive	\$0.26	\$206	0.7%	\$0.28	\$214	0.9%	6.2%
Regulation	\$0.12	\$94	0.3%	\$0.07	\$57	0.2%	(37.6%)
Black Start	\$0.05	\$42	0.1%	\$0.05	\$41	0.2%	0.4%
Synchronized Reserves	\$0.04	\$32	0.1%	\$0.03	\$22	0.1%	(30.9%)
Non-Synchronized Reserves	\$0.01	\$9	0.0%	\$0.01	\$7	0.0%	(13.4%)
Day Ahead Scheduling Reserve (DASR)	\$0.03	\$24	0.1%	\$0.01	\$11	0.0%	(52.2%)
Administration	\$0.32	\$257	0.8%	\$0.32	\$249	1.0%	(0.6%)
PJM Administrative Fees	\$0.30	\$239	0.8%	\$0.30	\$231	0.9%	(1.1%)
NERC/RFC	\$0.02	\$16	0.1%	\$0.02	\$17	0.1%	7.4%
RTO Startup and Expansion	\$0.00	\$2	0.0%	\$0.00	\$1	0.0%	0.0%
Energy Uplift (Operating Reserves)	\$0.15	\$119	0.4%	\$0.07	\$56	0.2%	(52.3%)
Demand Response	\$0.00	\$3	0.0%	\$0.00	\$2	0.0%	(26.8%)
Load Response	\$0.00	\$3	0.0%	\$0.00	\$2	0.0%	(48.8%)
Emergency Load Response	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	\$0.00	\$1	0.0%	0.0%
Emergency Energy	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0	0.0%	0.0%
Total Price	\$40.11	\$31,731	100.0%	\$31.83	\$24,571	100.0%	(20.6%)
Total Load (GWh)	791,094			771,929			(2.4%)
Total Billing (\$ Billions)	\$31.73			\$24.57			(22.6%)

PJM load

	PJM	Real-Time I	Demand (N	Year-to-Year Change				
	Lo	ad	Load Plus	s Exports	Lo	ad	Load Plus	s Exports
		Standard		Standard		Standard		Standard
	Load	Deviation	Demand	Deviation	Load	Deviation	Demand	Deviation
2001	30,297	5,873	32,165	5,564	NA	NA	NA	NA
2002	35,776	7,976	37,676	8,145	18.1%	35.8%	17.1%	46.4%
2003	37,395	6,834	39,380	6,716	4.5%	(14.3%)	4.5%	(17.5%)
2004	49,963	13,004	54,953	14,947	33.6%	90.3%	39.5%	122.6%
2005	78,150	16,296	85,301	16,546	56.4%	25.3%	55.2%	10.7%
2006	79,471	14,534	85,696	15,133	1.7%	(10.8%)	0.5%	(8.5%)
2007	81,681	14,618	87,897	15,199	2.8%	0.6%	2.6%	0.4%
2008	79,515	13,758	86,306	14,322	(2.7%)	(5.9%)	(1.8%)	(5.8%)
2009	76,034	13,260	81,227	13,792	(4.4%)	(3.6%)	(5.9%)	(3.7%)
2010	79,611	15,504	85,518	15,904	4.7%	16.9%	5.3%	15.3%
2011	82,541	16,156	88,466	16,313	3.7%	4.2%	3.4%	2.6%
2012	87,011	16,212	92,135	16,052	5.4%	0.3%	4.1%	(1.6%)
2013	88,332	15,489	92,879	15,418	1.5%	(4.5%)	0.8%	(3.9%)
2014	89,099	15,763	94,471	15,677	0.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
2015	88,594	16,663	92,665	16,784	(0.6%)	5.7%	(1.9%)	7.1%
2016	88,601	17,229	93,551	17,498	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	4.3%
2017	86,618	15,170	91,015	15,083	(2.2%)	(11.9%)	(2.7%)	(13.8%)
2018	90,308	15,982	94,351	16,142	4.3%	5.4%	3.7%	7.0%
2019	88,120	15,867	92,917	16,087	(2.4%)	(0.7%)	(1.5%)	(0.3%)



Real-time monthly average hourly load





Generation (By fuel source (GWh))

		20	18	20)19	
		GWh	Percent	GWh	Percent	Change in Output
Coal		239,612.2	28.6%	197,165.3	23.8%	(17.7%)
	Bituminous	201,123.6	24.0%	169,958.4	20.5%	(15.5%)
	Sub Bituminous	30,136.0	3.6%	20,981.8	2.5%	(30.4%)
	Other Coal	8,352.6	1.0%	6,225.2	0.8%	(25.5%)
Nuclear		286,155.4	34.2%	278,911.8	33.6%	(2.5%)
Gas		259,051.4	30.9%	302,116.9	36.4%	16.6%
	Natural Gas	256,701.9	30.6%	299,966.8	36.2%	16.9%
	Landfill Gas	2,309.7	0.3%	2,146.6	0.3%	(7.1%)
	Other Gas	39.8	0.0%	3.5	0.0%	(91.2%)
Hydroelec	tric	19,415.5	2.3%	16,696.7	2.0%	(14.0%)
	Pumped Storage	5,582.0	0.7%	4,642.9	0.6%	(16.8%)
	Run of River	12,051.5	1.4%	10,728.7	1.3%	(11.0%)
	Other Hydro	1,782.0	0.2%	1,325.1	0.2%	(25.6%)
Wind		21,628.0	2.6%	24,167.1	2.9%	11.7%
Waste		4,507.6	0.5%	4,237.3	0.5%	(6.0%)
	Solid Waste	4,236.1	0.5%	4,147.6	0.5%	(2.1%)
	Miscellaneous	271.5	0.0%	89.8	0.0%	(66.9%)
Oil		3,580.9	0.4%	1,788.0	0.2%	(50.1%)
	Heavy Oil	435.5	0.1%	102.9	0.0%	(76.4%)
	Light Oil	975.2	0.1%	271.9	0.0%	(72.1%)
	Diesel	363.7	0.0%	71.7	0.0%	(80.3%)
	Gasoline	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	NA
	Kerosene	59.7	0.0%	10.1	0.0%	(83.1%)
	Jet Oil	8.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	(100.0%)
	Other Oil	1,738.8	0.2%	1,331.4	0.2%	(23.4%)
Solar, Net	t Energy Metering	2,110.6	0.3%	2,780.6	0.3%	31.7%
Battery		14.4	0.0%	18.8	0.0%	30.9%
Biofuel		1,572.5	0.2%	1,279.6	0.2%	(18.6%)
Total		837,648.4	100.0%	829,162.1	100.0%	(1.0%)





Capacity Factor by unit type

	_2018	2018201		2019		
Unit Type	Generation (GWh)	Capacity Factor	Generation (GWh)	Capacity Factor	from 2018	
Battery	14.3	0.6%	18.8	0.6%	0.1%	
Combined Cycle	234,614.7	59.3%	278,310.5	63.6%	4.3%	
Single Fuel	194,921.2	62.6%	236,429.8	68.6%	6.0%	
Dual Fuel	39,693.5	47.1%	41,880.7	45.1%	(2.1%)	
Combustion Turbine	17,590.9	6.9%	16,351.6	6.4%	(0.5%)	
Single Fuel	11,561.4	6.2%	11,201.7	6.0%	(0.2%)	
Dual Fuel	6,029.4	8.9%	5,149.9	7.5%	(1.4%)	
Diesel	314.7	9.5%	262.3	7.6%	(1.9%)	
Single Fuel	304.7	10.3%	257.5	8.3%	(2.0%)	
Dual Fuel	9.9	2.7%	4.8	1.3%	(1.4%)	
Diesel (Landfill gas)	1,780.5	51.6%	1,656.6	49.1%	(2.5%)	
Fuel Cell	225.9	82.9%	212.8	77.0%	(5.9%)	
Nuclear	286,155.4	94.2%	278,911.8	93.6%	(0.6%)	
Pumped Storage Hydro	7,004.9	15.8%	5,621.2	12.7%	(3.1%)	
Run of River Hydro	12,410.6	46.8%	11,075.5	41.6%	(5.2%)	
Solar	2,104.9	17.7%	2,725.4	18.5%	0.9%	
Steam	253,796.2	39.0%	209,793.2	35.7%	(3.4%)	
Biomass	6,421.4	62.7%	5,837.3	60.1%	(2.5%)	
Coal	241,022.0	44.4%	197,733.8	40.6%	(3.8%)	
Single Fuel	235,262.5	45.8%	193,841.1	42.4%	(3.5%)	
Dual Fuel	5,759.5	19.6%	3,892.7	13.2%	(6.4%)	
Natural Gas	5,987.5	37.1%	6,122.3	41.0%	3.9%	
Single Fuel	637.8	43.6%	403.9	49.1%	5.5%	
Dual Fuel	5,349.7	23.2%	5,718.4	23.1%	(0.1%)	
Oil	365.2	1.3%	99.8	0.5%	(0.8%)	
Wind	21,626.8	28.4%	24,167.0	29.6%	1.2%	
- Total	837,644.2	47.3%	829,110.9	47.2%	(0.1%)	



Fuel diversity index for energy



©2020

Real-time generation less real-time load



Real-time, load-weighted, average LMP

	Real-Time, Load-Weighted, Average LMP				r-to-Year Chai	nge
			Standard			Standard
	Average	Median	Deviation	Average	Median	Deviation
1998	\$24.16	\$17.60	\$39.29	NA	NA	NA
1999	\$34.07	\$19.02	\$91.49	41.0%	8.1%	132.8%
2000	\$30.72	\$20.51	\$28.38	(9.8%)	7.9%	(69.0%)
2001	\$36.65	\$25.08	\$57.26	19.3%	22.3%	101.8%
2002	\$31.60	\$23.40	\$26.75	(13.8%)	(6.7%)	(53.3%)
2003	\$41.23	\$34.96	\$25.40	30.5%	49.4%	(5.0%)
2004	\$44.34	\$40.16	\$21.25	7.5%	14.9%	(16.3%)
2005	\$63.46	\$52.93	\$38.10	43.1%	31.8%	79.3%
2006	\$53.35	\$44.40	\$37.81	(15.9%)	(16.1%)	(0.7%)
2007	\$61.66	\$54.66	\$36.94	15.6%	23.1%	(2.3%)
2008	\$71.13	\$59.54	\$40.97	15.4%	8.9%	10.9%
2009	\$39.05	\$34.23	\$18.21	(45.1%)	(42.5%)	(55.6%)
2010	\$48.35	\$39.13	\$28.90	23.8%	14.3%	58.7%
2011	\$45.94	\$36.54	\$33.47	(5.0%)	(6.6%)	15.8%
2012	\$35.23	\$30.43	\$23.66	(23.3%)	(16.7%)	(29.3%)
2013	\$38.66	\$33.25	\$23.78	9.7%	9.3%	0.5%
2014	\$53.14	\$36.20	\$76.20	37.4%	8.9%	220.4%
2015	\$36.16	\$27.66	\$31.06	(31.9%)	(23.6%)	(59.2%)
2016	\$29.23	\$25.01	\$16.12	(19.2%)	(9.6%)	(48.1%)
2017	\$30.99	\$26.35	\$19.32	6.0%	5.4%	19.9%
2018	\$38.24	\$29.55	\$32.89	23.4%	12.1%	70.2%
2019	\$27.32	\$23.63	\$23.12	(28.6%)	(20.0%)	(29.7%)



Real-time, load-weighted, average LMP



Real-time, load-weighted, average LMP



18



Average short run marginal costs





Type of fuel used (by real-time marginal units)





Real-time, fuel-cost adjusted, load-weighted average LMP

	2019 Fuel-Cost Adjusted,			Percent
	Load-Weighted LMP	2019 Load-Weighted LMP	Change	Change
Average	\$31.86	\$27.32	(\$4.54)	(14.2%)
		2019 Fuel-Cost Adjusted,		Percent
	2018 Load-Weighted LMP	Load-Weighted LMP	Change	Change
Average	\$38.24	\$31.86	(\$6.39)	(16.7%)
	2018 Load-Weighted LMP	2019 Load-Weighted LMP	Change	Change
Average	\$38.24	\$27.32	(\$10.92)	(28.6%)



Components of real-time, load-weighted, average LMP

	2018		2019		Change
Element	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Percent
Gas	\$16.26	42.5%	\$11.50	42.1%	(0.4%)
Coal	\$7.44	19.5%	\$7.21	26.4%	6.9%
Ten Percent Adder	\$2.74	7.2%	\$2.07	7.6%	0.4%
Constraint Violation Adder	(\$0.00)	(0.0%)	\$1.85	6.8%	6.8%
VOM	\$1.46	3.8%	\$1.71	6.2%	2.4%
Markup	\$4.56	11.9%	\$1.58	5.8%	(6.2%)
NA	\$1.78	4.6%	\$0.36	1.3%	(3.3%)
Ancillary Service Redispatch Cost	\$0.44	1.2%	\$0.24	0.9%	(0.3%)
Scarcity Adder	\$0.02	0.1%	\$0.24	0.9%	0.8%
CO ₂ Cost	\$0.16	0.4%	\$0.21	0.8%	0.3%
LPA Rounding Difference	\$0.61	1.6%	\$0.15	0.5%	(1.0%)
Opportunity Cost Adder	\$0.10	0.3%	\$0.10	0.4%	0.1%
Increase Generation Adder	\$0.82	2.1%	\$0.10	0.4%	(1.8%)
Oil	\$1.75	4.6%	\$0.06	0.2%	(4.3%)
NO _x Cost	\$0.09	0.2%	\$0.02	0.1%	(0.2%)
LPA-SCED Differential	(\$0.02)	(0.0%)	\$0.01	0.0%	0.1%
Other	\$0.06	0.1%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.1%)
Market-to-Market Adder	\$0.01	0.0%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.0%)
SO ₂ Cost	\$0.01	0.0%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.0%)
Landfill Gas	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	0.0%	0.0%
Uranium	(\$0.00)	(0.0%)	\$0.00	0.0%	0.0%
Municipal Waste	\$0.10	0.3%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.3%)
Wind	(\$0.01)	(0.0%)	\$0.00	0.0%	0.0%
Renewable Energy Credits	(\$0.03)	(0.1%)	(\$0.02)	(0.1%)	(0.0%)
Decrease Generation Adder	(\$0.10)	(0.3%)	(\$0.05)	(0.2%)	0.1%
Total	\$38.24	100.0%	\$27.32	100.0%	0.0%





Pivotal suppliers in the day-ahead energy market





Offer capping – energy only

	Real-Tir	ne	Day-Ahe	ead
	Unit Hours	MWh	Unit Hours	MWh
Year	Capped	Capped	Capped	Capped
2015	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
2016	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2017	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2018	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%
2019	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%



Monthly bid and cleared INCs, DECs and UTCs





UTC transactions by type of parent organization

			2019					
	Total Up to		Total Up to Congestion		Total Up to		Total Up to Congestion	
Category	Congestion Bid	Percent	Cleared MWh	Percent	Congestion Bid	Percent	Cleared MWh	Percent
Financial	502,640,657	97.8%	147,233,232	95.4%	555,951,114	97.7%	174,145,737	95.3%
Physical	11,131,422	2.2%	7,154,781	4.6%	13,031,324	2.3%	8,626,176	4.7%
Total	513,772,079	100.0%	154,388,014	100.0%	568,982,438	100.0%	182,771,913	100.0%



Monitoring Analytics

Total congestion

Congestion Costs (I	Millions)
---------------------	-----------

				Percent of PJM
	Congestion Cost	Percent Change	Total PJM Billing	Billing
2008	\$2,052	NA	\$34,300	6.0%
2009	\$719	(65.0%)	\$26,550	2.7%
2010	\$1,423	98.0%	\$34,770	4.1%
2011	\$999	(29.8%)	\$35,890	2.8%
2012	\$529	(47.0%)	\$29,180	1.8%
2013	\$677	28.0%	\$33,860	2.0%
2014	\$1,932	185.5%	\$50,030	3.9%
2015	\$1,385	(28.3%)	\$42,630	3.2%
2016	\$1,024	(26.1%)	\$39,050	2.6%
2017	\$698	(31.9%)	\$40,170	1.7%
2018	\$1,310	87.8%	\$49,790	2.6%
2019	\$583	(55.5%)	\$39,200	1.5%





©2020







Monthly total congestion

Real-time hourly load weighted average LMP: October 1, 2019





RT SCED solutions not approved from 1648 through 1714 EPT: Oct 1, 2019

		Load Bias Solution			
SCED Case ID	SCED Target Time	Low	Mid	High	
1	01-Oct 17:00				
2	01-Oct 17:05				
3	01-Oct 17:05				
4	01-Oct 17:10	Shortage	Shortage	Shortage	
5	01-Oct 17:10	Shortage	Shortage	Shortage	
6	01-Oct 17:15	Shortage	Shortage	Shortage	
7	01-Oct 17:15		Shortage	Shortage	
8	01-Oct 17:20		Shortage	Shortage	
9	01-Oct 17:20			Shortage	
©2020 www	w.monitoringanalytics.com 3	60		Monitoring And	

The capacity market results were not competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design	
Market Structure: Aggregate Market	Not Competitive		
Market Structure: Local Market	Not Competitive		
Participant Behavior	Not Competitive		
Market Performance	Not Competitive	Mixed	

Monitoring Analytics

Recommendations: Capacity Market

- Offer cap calculation should be based on economic logic of CP and actual PAH and not default to Net CONE*B.
- Consistent definition of a capacity resource as physical at time of auction and delivery year.
- Net revenue calculation for offer caps should be based on lower of price or cost.
- All capacity imports should be deliverable to an LDA.
- Definition of LDA should be dynamic and market based.
- Improve market clearing rules by including make whole and nesting in optimization.
- Maintain performance incentives and product definitions in Capacity Performance design.
- Modify RMR rules to eliminate overpayment.
- Set the maximum price on the VRR curve to net CONE.



Recommendations: Capacity Market

- Implement Sustainable Market Rule (SMR).
- Offer cap calculation should be based on economic logic of CP and actual PAH and not default to Net CONE*B.
- All capacity imports should be deliverable to an LDA.
- Consistent definition of a capacity resource as physical at time of auction and delivery year.
- Definition of LDA should be dynamic and market based.
- Net revenue calculation for offer caps should be based on lower of price or cost.
- Improve market clearing rules by including make whole and nesting in optimization.
- Maintain performance incentives and product definitions in Capacity Performance design.
- RMR rules should be modified.



Installed capacity by fuel source

	01-Jan-19		31-May-19		01-Jun-19		31-Dec-19	
	MW	Percent	MW	Percent	MW	Percent	MW	Percent
Coal	60,763.4	32.6%	58,833.6	31.7%	58,043.9	31.0%	56,311.0	30.5%
Gas	75,261.2	40.4%	75,770.8	40.9%	78,475.8	41.9%	78,230.9	42.3%
Hydroelectric	8,888.2	4.8%	8,873.9	4.8%	8,873.9	4.7%	8,873.9	4.8%
Nuclear	32,684.5	17.5%	33,000.7	17.8%	33,001.7	17.6%	32,297.9	17.5%
Oil	6,388.2	3.4%	6,342.2	3.4%	6,330.2	3.4%	6,311.0	3.4%
Solar	640.0	0.3%	686.2	0.4%	702.6	0.4%	791.0	0.4%
Solid waste	712.3	0.4%	712.3	0.4%	702.3	0.4%	695.6	0.4%
Wind	1,158.3	0.6%	1,158.3	0.6%	1,192.2	0.6%	1,232.2	0.7%
Total	186,496.1	100.0%	185,378.0	100.0%	187,322.6	100.0%	184,743.5	100.0%





Monitoring Analytics

Percent of installed capacity (by fuel source)



www.monitoringanalytics.com

Monitoring Analytics

Fuel Diversity Index for capacity


PJM EFORd





History of capacity prices



Map of RPM capacity prices







Levelized cost of energy: 2019

						Wind	Wind	
	СТ	CC	СР	DS	Nuclear	(On Shore)	(Off Shore)	Solar
Levelized cost (\$/MW-year)	\$121,612	\$116,781	\$581,567	\$169,859	\$1,383,428	\$214,618	\$710,472	\$243,936
Short run marginal costs (\$/MWh)	\$24.03	\$17.15	\$29.65	\$150.66	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capacity factor (%)	52%	77%	24%	1%	94%	26%	45%	17%
Levelized cost of energy (\$/MWh)	\$51	\$34	\$307	\$3,039	\$168	\$93	\$180	\$163



Historical new entrant CC revenue adequacy





Avoidable cost recovery by quartile

		Recovery	of avoidable co	osts from	Recovery of avoidable costs				
	Total Installed	energy a	energy and ancillary net revenue			from all markets			
Technology	Capacity (ICAP)	First quartile	Median	Third quartile	First quartile	Median	Third quartile		
CC - Combined Cy	cle 31,318	38%	214%	380%	415%	561%	796%		
CT - Aero Derivativ	e 5,893	4%	31%	69%	381%	511%	592%		
CT - Industrial Fran	ne 21,030	0%	9%	24%	292%	438%	642%		
Coal Fired	47,966	0%	0%	14%	51%	71%	104%		
Diesel	289	0%	0%	7%	210%	354%	474%		
Hydro	2,329	285%	304%	450%	425%	473%	659%		
Nuclear	30,351	74%	79%	89%	102%	106%	109%		
Oil or Gas Steam	10,490	0%	0%	1%	106%	149%	209%		
Pumped Storage	4,721	187%	429%	429%	769%	1,011%	1,089%		



Proportion of units recovering avoidable costs

	Units with full recovery from																		
	energy and ancillary net revenue							Uni	ts with	full red	covery	from a	ll mark	ets					
Technology		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
CC - Combined Cy	cle	55%	46%	50%	72%	5 9 %	63%	57%	66%	66%	85%	79%	79%	95%	88%	93%	89%	98%	97%
CT - Aero Derivativ	'e	15%	6%	6%	53%	15%	8%	10%	30%	7%	100%	96%	76%	98%	100%	99%	100%	99%	96%
CT - Industrial Fran	ne	26%	23%	17%	38%	13%	8%	3%	21%	7%	99%	98%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	88%
Coal Fired		31%	17%	27%	78%	16%	15%	12%	11%	2%	82%	36%	54%	83%	64%	40%	36%	63%	26%
Diesel		48%	42%	37%	69%	56%	33%	32%	39%	9%	100%	100%	77%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	91%
Hydro		74%	61%	95%	97%	81%	79%	9 5%	94%	95%	81%	77%	97%	98%	100%	100%	97%	98%	100%
Nuclear		-	-	50%	94%	17%	6%	17%	53%	0%	-	-	61%	100%	56%	17%	50%	88%	81%
Oil or Gas Steam		8%	6%	11%	15%	3%	0%	0%	10%	75%	92%	78%	86%	85%	91%	88%	81%	76%	76%
Pumped Storage		100%	100%	9 5%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



Monitoring Analytics

New entrant CT net revenue and cost





New entrant CC net revenue and cost





New entrant coal plant net revenue and cost





New entrant nuclear plant net revenue and cost





Nuclear unit forward annual surplus (shortfall)

		Surr (Shor	olus tfall) Wb)	Surplus (Shortfall)
	(MW)	2020	2021	2020	2021
Beaver Valley	1,808	\$0.92	\$3.41	\$13.6	\$50.3
Braidwood	2,337	\$3.02	\$4.09	\$57.8	\$78.1
Byron	2,300	\$2.00	\$3.05	\$37.7	\$57.2
Calvert Cliffs	1,708	\$2.29	\$4.76	\$32.0	\$66.4
Davis Besse	894	(\$12.10)	(\$8.79)	(\$88.7)	(\$64.2)
Dresden	1,797	\$3.57	\$4.67	\$52.5	\$68.7
Hope Creek	1,172	\$1.50	\$3.52	\$14.4	\$33.7
LaSalle	2,271	\$2.82	\$3.89	\$52.5	\$72.2
Limerick	2,242	\$1.28	\$3.30	\$23.5	\$60.4
North Anna	1,892	\$1.61	\$4.13	\$24.9	\$63.9
Peach Bottom	2,347	\$0.66	\$2.63	\$12.7	\$50.4
Perry	1,240	(\$11.50)	(\$8.14)	(\$116.9)	(\$82.5)
Quad Cities	1,819	\$0.77	\$1.82	\$11.5	\$27.0
Salem	2,328	\$1.22	\$3.24	\$23.2	\$61.6
Surry	1,676	\$0.81	\$3.32	\$11.1	\$45.5
Susquehanna	2,520	(\$3.24)	(\$1.07)	(\$67.0)	(\$21.9)



Nuclear unit implied net ACR

		Ν	Net ACR			Net ACR		Net ACR	Excluding	Capital
	ICAP	((\$/MWh)		(\$/MW-Day	/)	(9	S/MW-Day)	
	(MW)	2020	2021	2022	2020	2021	2022	2020	2021	2022
Beaver Valley	1,808	\$2.90	\$1.63	\$1.75	\$69.69	\$39.10	\$41.94	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Braidwood	2,337	\$5.58	\$4.43	\$4.54	\$133.91	\$106.36	\$108.98	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Byron	2,300	\$6.60	\$5.47	\$5.58	\$158.29	\$131.40	\$133.83	\$23.41	\$0.00	\$0.00
Calvert Cliffs	1,708	\$1.79	\$0.45	\$0.57	\$42.85	\$10.80	\$13.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Davis Besse	894	\$15.92	\$14.64	\$14.75	\$382.12	\$351.30	\$353.94	\$181.96	\$151.14	\$153.78
Dresden	1,797	\$5.03	\$3.85	\$3.95	\$120.73	\$92.29	\$94.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hope Creek	1,172	\$5.56	\$4.22	\$4.28	\$133.47	\$101.37	\$102.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LaSalle	2,271	\$5.77	\$4.63	\$4.73	\$138.60	\$111.06	\$113.60	\$3.72	\$0.00	\$0.00
Limerick	2,242	\$5.79	\$4.44	\$4.50	\$138.90	\$106.65	\$107.99	\$4.02	\$0.00	\$0.00
North Anna	1,892	\$2.21	\$0.90	\$1.03	\$53.07	\$21.66	\$24.66	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Peach Bottom	2,347	\$6.41	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$153.72	\$122.76	\$124.16	\$18.84	\$0.00	\$0.00
Perry	1,240	\$15.32	\$13.99	\$14.10	\$367.76	\$335.74	\$338.40	\$167.60	\$135.58	\$138.24
Quad Cities	1,819	\$7.82	\$6.70	\$6.79	\$187.78	\$160.83	\$162.89	\$52.90	\$25.95	\$28.01
Salem	2,328	\$5.85	\$4.50	\$4.56	\$140.32	\$108.10	\$109.40	\$5.44	\$0.00	\$0.00
Surry	1,676	\$3.01	\$1.71	\$1.82	\$72.24	\$41.13	\$43.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Susquehanna	2,520	\$7.31	\$6.27	\$6.38	\$175.36	\$150.58	\$153.02	\$40.48	\$15.70	\$18.14



Profile of units at risk of retirement

Technology	No. Units	ACR (\$/MW-day)	ICAP (MW)	Avg. 2019 Run Hrs	Avg. Unit Age (Yrs)	Avg. Heat Rate (Btu/MWh)
Coal Fired	8	\$115.48	4,306	3,127	50	10,072
CT and Diesel	101	\$107.96 CT / \$55.96 DS	3,103	78	46	15,145
Nuclear	2	\$940.46 single unit	2,134	-	37	· · ·
Total	111	-	9,543	-	-	-



Reserve Margin

	Generation and DR RPM Committed Less	Forecast	FRR		RPM Peak		Pool Wide Average	Generation and DR RPM Committed Less	Reserve	Reserve in Exces	e Margin s of IRM	Projected Replacement Capacity using Cleared	Projected
	Deficiency UCAP (MW)	Peak Load	Peak Load	PRD	Load	IRM	EFORd	Deficiency ICAP (MW)	Margin	Percent	ICAP (MW)	Buy Bids UCAP (MW)	Reserve Margin
01-Jun-16	160,883.3	152,356.6	12,511.6	0.0	139,845.0	16.4%	5.91%	170,988.7	22.3%	5.9%	8,209.2	0.0	22.3%
01-Jun-17	163,872.0	153,230.1	12,837.5	0.0	140,392.6	16.6%	5.94%	174,220.7	24.1%	7.5%	10,522.9	0.0	24.1%
01-Jun-18	161,242.6	152,407.9	12,732.9	0.0	139,675.0	16.1%	6.07%	171,662.5	22.9%	6.8%	9,499.8	0.0	22.9%
01-Jun-19	162,276.1	151,643.5	12,284.2	0.0	139,359.3	16.0%	6.08%	172,781.2	24.0%	8.0%	11,124.4	0.0	24.0%
01-Jun-20	164,428.4	151,155.1	11,930.9	558.0	138,666.2	15.9%	6.04%	174,998.3	26.2%	10.3%	14,284.2	2,335.0	24.4%
01-Jun-21	161,959.4	151,832.3	11,982.6	510.0	139,339.7	15.8%	6.01%	172,315.6	23.7%	7.9%	10,960.2	1,232.8	22.7%



Map of PJM unit retirements





RMR history

Unit Names	Owner	ICAP (MW) Cost Recovery Method	Docket Numbers	Start of Term	End of Term
B.L. England 2	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC	150.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER17-1083	01-May-17	30-Apr-19
Yorktown 1	Dominion Virginia Power	159.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER17-750	06-Jan-17	08-Mar-19
Yorktown 2	Dominion Virginia Power	164.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER17-750	06-Jan-17	08-Mar-19
B.L. England 3	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC	148.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER17-1083	01-May-17	24-Jan-18
Ashtabula	FirstEnergy Service Company	210.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	11-Apr-15
Eastlake 1	FirstEnergy Service Company	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Eastlake 2	FirstEnergy Service Company	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Eastlake 3	FirstEnergy Service Company	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Lakeshore	FirstEnergy Service Company	190.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Elrama 4	GenOn Power Midwest, LP	171.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER12-1901	01-Jun-12	01-Oct-12
Niles 1	GenOn Power Midwest, LP	109.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER12-1901	01-Jun-12	01-Oct-12
Cromby 2 and Diesel	Exelon Generation Company, LLC	203.7 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER10-1418	01-Jun-11	01-Jan-12
Eddystone 2	Exelon Generation Company, LLC	309.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER10-1418	01-Jun-11	01-Jun-12
Brunot Island CT2A, CT2B, CT3 and CC4	Orion Power MidWest, L.P.	244.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER06-993	16-May-06	05-Jul-07
Hudson 1	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG Fossil LLC	355.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER05-644, ER11-2688	25-Feb-05	08-Dec-11
Sewaren 1-4	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG Fossil LLC	453.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER05-644	25-Feb-05	01-Sep-08





Recommendations: Planning

- Increase the role of competition in transmission consistent with Order 1000
 - Eliminate the exemption of supplemental projects
 - Eliminate the exemption of end of life projects
 - Implement robust evaluation of competing cost containment project and cost of service project proposals
- The rules governing cost/benefit analysis for evaluation of transmission projects should be modified to include all costs in all zones.

Recommendations: Energy Market Uplift

- Develop and implement an accurate metric for following dispatch to determine uplift eligibility.
- Eliminate exemption for fast start resources from the requirement to follow dispatch to be eligible for uplift.
- Pay uplift based on the lower of the actual or dispatch MW.
- Calculate uplift on a 24 hour basis, not by segments or five minute intervals.
- Make transparent day ahead reliability commitments, according to the same rules as real time commitments.
- Do not use closed loop interfaces to artificially set price for the sole purpose of reducing uplift.
- Allocate uplift to UTC transactions.







Total energy uplift charges

	Total Enorgy Inlift			Energy Uplift as a
	Charges (Millions)	Change (Millions)	Percent Change	Percent of Total PJM Billing
2001	\$284.0	\$67.0	30.9%	8.5%
2002	\$273.7	(\$10.3)	(3.6%)	5.8%
2003	\$376.5	\$102.8	37.6%	5.4%
2004	\$537.6	\$161.1	42.8%	6.1%
2005	\$712.6	\$175.0	32.6%	3.1%
2006	\$365.6	(\$347.0)	(48.7%)	1.7%
2007	\$503.3	\$137.7	37.7%	1.6%
2008	\$474.3	(\$29.0)	(5.8%)	1.4%
2009	\$322.7	(\$151.6)	(32.0%)	1.2%
2010	\$623.2	\$300.5	93.1%	1.8%
2011	\$603.4	(\$19.8)	(3.2%)	1.7%
2012	\$649.8	\$46.4	7.7%	2.2%
2013	\$843.0	\$193.2	29.7%	2.5%
2014	\$961.2	\$118.2	14.0%	1.9%
2015	\$312.0	(\$649.2)	(67.5%)	0.7%
2016	\$136.7	(\$175.3)	(56.2%)	0.4%
2017	\$127.3	(\$9.4)	(6.9%)	0.3%
2018	\$198.2	\$70.9	55.7%	0.4%
2019	\$88.6	(\$109.6)	(55.3%)	0.2%



Energy uplift credits by unit type

				Local	Lost			
	Day-Ahead	Balancing	Canceled	Constraints	Opportunity	Reactive	Synchronous	Black Start
Unit Type	Generator	Generator	Resources	Control	Cost	Services	Condensing	Services
Combined Cycle	3.2%	4.1%	0.0%	7.6%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	24.6%
Combustion Turbine	1.7%	86.3%	0.0%	81.8%	93.7%	43.6%	0.0%	75.3%
Diesel	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	10.2%	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%
Hydro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nuclear	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Solar	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Steam - Coal	88.3%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	55.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Steam - Other	6.9%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wind	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total (Millions)	\$15.5	\$52.1	\$0.0	\$2.9	\$17.5	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.2



Top 10 units and organizations energy uplift credits

		Тор 10 Լ	Jnits	Top 10 Organizations		
Category	Туре	Credits (Millions)	Credits Share	Credits (Millions)	Credits Share	
Day-Ahead	Generators	\$13.4	86.5%	\$15.2	98.3%	
	Canceled Resources	\$0.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	
Delensing	Generators	\$6.5	12.5%	\$38.4	73.7%	
Dalahuliy	Local Constraints Control	\$1.8	62.5%	\$2.9	100.0%	
	Lost Opportunity Cost	\$4.3	25.0%	\$12.9	75.0%	
Reactive Services		\$0.5	91.6%	\$0.6	100.0%	
Synchronous Condensing		\$0.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	
Black Start Services		\$0.1	39.7%	\$0.2	88.7%	
Total		\$18.4	20.7%	\$64.6	72.9%	



Operating reserve rates statistics (\$/MWh)

		Ra	ates Charg	ed (\$/MWh)
					Standard
Region	Transactio	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Deviation
	INC	2.283	0.323	<0.001	0.372
	DEC	2.298	0.342	<0.001	0.373
East	DA Load	0.200	0.019	<0.001	0.031
	RT Load	0.437	0.027	<0.001	0.044
	Deviation	2.283	0.323	<0.001	0.372
	INC	2.283	0.303	<0.001	0.359
	DEC	2.298	0.322	<0.001	0.361
West	DA Load	0.200	0.019	<0.001	0.031
	RT Load	0.391	0.025	<0.001	0.040
	Deviation	2.283	0.303	<0.001	0.359



59

Recommendations: Demand Response

- Demand response should be removed from PJM Capacity Market.
 - On demand side of market
 - Redesign to facilitate customers' response to prices
 - Payment should be immediate
 - Impact on forecasts should be immediate
 - Metered use is sole basis for payment. No M&V.
- Eliminate guaranteed DR strike price; pay LMP
- DR offer cap should be the same as generation
- Demand response should be fully nodal
- Demand response should be an economic resource
- M&V: cap baselines at PLC uniformly including winter
- EE should be removed from PJM Capacity Market.





Economic program credits and MWh by month





Monitoring Analytics

61

Demand response revenue by market





Recommendations: Transactions

- Submit transactions consistent with power flow not scheduled paths.
- Implement rules to prevent breaking up transactions to evade rules.
- Implement rules to prevent sham scheduling.
- Eliminate outdated definitions of interface pricing points.
- Permit unlimited spot imports.
- Interchange pricing should reflect LMP logic.
 - No need for scheduling physical transactions.
- Make actual flow data available for eastern interconnection to MMUs and RTOs/ISOs.
- Address firm flow entitlement rules that use stale data.





PJM's footprint and its external scheduling interfaces





Scheduled import and export transaction volume history





Monitoring Analytics

The regulation market results were competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure	Not Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Competitive	
Market Performance	Competitive	Flawed



Monitoring Analytics

The tier 2 synchronized reserve market results were competitive

Markot Flomont	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure: Regional Markets	Not Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Competitive	
Market Performance	Competitive	Mixed
©2020 www.monitoringanalytics.com	67	Monitoring Analytics

The DASR market results were competitive

Market Element		Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure		Not Competitive	
Participant Behavior		Mixed	
Market Performance		Competitive	Mixed
©2020 www	v.monitoringanalytics.com	68	Monitoring Analytics

Recommendations: Ancillary Services

- Regulation market should incorporate consistent application of marginal benefit factor including optimization, assignment and settlements.
- LOC should be based on unit's operating schedule in the energy market.
- The \$7.50 markup should be eliminated from synchronized reserve offers.
- Remove the ability to make dual offers (both RegA and RegD) from the regulation market.
- Nonperformance penalties for synchronized reserves should begin with the last successful response.
- The cost of reactive capability should be incorporated in the capacity market.
- Minimum tank suction levels should be fixed.



Average price and cost for regulation

Weighted Regul Market	ation W Price	eighted Regulation Market Cost	Regulation Price as Percent Cost
\$	23.00	\$7.68	299.2%
\$	18.00	\$14.85	121.2%
\$	16.49	\$13.23	124.6%
\$	19.02	\$12.90	147.5%
\$	30.85	\$35.79	86.2%
\$	44.49	\$53.82	82.7%
\$	31.92	\$38.36	83.2%
\$	15.73	\$18.13	86.7%
\$	16.79	\$23.03	72.9%
\$	25.32	\$31.93	79.3%
\$	16.27	\$20.31	80.1%
	Weighted Regul Market \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Weighted Regulation Market Price Weighted Regulation Market Price \$23.00 \$ \$18.00 \$ \$18.00 \$ \$16.49 \$ \$19.02 \$ \$30.85 \$ \$31.92 \$ \$15.73 \$ \$16.79 \$ \$25.32 \$ \$16.27 \$	Weighted Regulation Market PriceWeighted Regulation Market Cost\$23.00\$7.68\$23.00\$7.68\$18.00\$14.85\$16.49\$13.23\$19.02\$12.90\$30.85\$35.79\$44.49\$53.82\$31.92\$38.36\$15.73\$18.13\$16.79\$23.03\$16.27\$20.31



FTR auction markets results were competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure	Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Partially Competitive	
Market Performance	Competitive	Flawed
©2020 www.monitoringanalytics.com	71	Monitoring Analytics

Recommendations: FTR/ARR

- ARR/FTR design should be modified to ensure that load has the right to all congestion revenues.
- Eliminate use of generation to load contract paths for allocating ARRs.
- Full system transmission capability assigned to ARRs.
- All FTR auction revenues and all congestion in excess of target allocations should be returned to load monthly.
- The long term FTR product should be eliminated.




FTR payout ratio





ARR and FTR total congestion offset for ARR holders

							Pre 2017	/2018	2017/201	8 (With	Post 201	7/2018
Revenue							(Without Balancing)		Balancing)		(With Surplus)	
				Balancing +			Total		Current		New	
Planning	ARR	FTR	Day Ahead	M2M	Total	Surplus	ARR/FTR	Percent	Revenue	Percent	Revenue	New
Period	Credits	Credits	Congestion	Congestion	Congestion	Revenue	Offset	Offset	Received	Offset	Received	Offset
2011/2012	\$512.2	\$249.8	\$1,025.4	(\$275.7)	\$749.7	(\$192.5)	\$762.0	101.6%	\$598.6	79.8%	\$563.0	79.8%
2012/2013	\$349.5	\$181.9	\$904.7	(\$379.9)	\$524.8	(\$292.3)	\$531.4	101.3%	\$275.9	52.6%	\$257.5	52.6%
2013/2014	\$337.7	\$456.4	\$2,231.3	(\$360.6)	\$1,870.6	(\$678.7)	\$794.0	42.4%	\$574.1	30.7%	\$623.1	30.7%
2014/2015	\$482.4	\$404.4	\$1,625.9	(\$268.3)	\$1,357.6	\$139.6	\$886.8	65.3%	\$686.6	50.6%	\$715.0	52.7%
2015/2016	\$635.3	\$223.4	\$1,098.7	(\$147.6)	\$951.1	\$42.5	\$858.8	90.3%	\$744.8	78.3%	\$745.2	78.4%
2016/2017	\$640.0	\$169.1	\$885.7	(\$104.8)	\$780.8	\$72.6	\$809.1	103.6%	\$727.7	93.2%	\$763.8	97.8%
2017/2018	\$427.3	\$294.2	\$1,322.1	(\$129.5)	\$1,192.6	\$371.2	\$721.5	60.5%	\$595.7	50.0%	\$886.5	74.3%
2018/2019	\$529.1	\$130.1	\$832.7	(\$152.6)	\$680.0	\$112.3	\$675.93	99.4%	\$530.8	78.1%	\$626.3	92.1%
2019/2020*	\$315.8	\$66.1	\$438.9	(\$104.3)	\$334.6	\$73.2	\$395.38	118.2%	\$296.3	88.6%	\$356.1	106.4%
Total	\$4,229.4	\$2,175.3	\$10,365.3	(\$1,923.4)	\$8,441.9	(\$352.2)	\$6,434.9	76.2%	\$5,030.7	59.6%	\$5,536.7	65.6%

* Seven months of 2019/2020 planning period



FTR profits and revenues by organization type and FTR direction

	Pur	chased FTRs Profit	Self Scheduled FTRs Revenue Returned				
Organization Ty	pe Prevailing Flow	Counter Flow	Total	Prevailing Flow	Counter Flow	Total	
Financial	(\$98,538,105)	\$121,282,178	\$22,744,074	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Physical	(\$54,688,836)	\$23,407,863	(\$31,280,973)	\$70,092,097	\$342,145	\$70,434,243	
Total	(\$153,226,941)	\$144,690,041	(\$8,536,900)	\$70,092,097	\$342,145	\$70,434,243	



Market Monitoring Unit

The State of the Market Report is the work of the entire Market Monitoring Unit.



Monitoring Analytics, LLC 2621 Van Buren Avenue Suite 160 Eagleville, PA 19403 (610) 271-8050

MA@monitoringanalytics.com www.MonitoringAnalytics.com

